

Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS THIRD SESSION.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, January 29, 1921.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 26, 1921.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has a communication from the Department of State in reference to certain documents which the department have no authority to destroy and which they deem of no value. The Chair will refer it to a Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, to be selected by the Chair. He appoints Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr. FRANCE members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and directs the Secretary to notify the House of Representatives.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Henderson	McCumber	Ransdell
Capper	Hitchcock	McKellar	Sheppard
Colt	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Culberson	Kendrick	Moses	Smoot
Curtis	Kenyon	Myers	Spencer
Dial	Keyes	Nelson	Swanson
Dillingham	King	Overman	Thomas
Gooding	Kirby	Page	Trammell
Gronna	Knox	Penrose	Underwood
Harris	Lenroot	Phelps	Wadsworth
Heflin	Lodge	Poindexter	

Mr. POINDEXTER. I wish to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] is absent, engaged on official business.

Mr. KENYON. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on official business of the Senate before the Committee on Manufactures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The reading clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. GERRY, Mr. JOHNSON of California, and Mr. STERLING answered to their names when called.

Mr. FRANCE and Mr. WARREN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent by reason of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate.

Mr. FERNALD, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. McLEAN, and Mr. SUTHERLAND entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) directing the method of counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States and declaring the result,

had appointed Mr. LAMPERT and Mr. RUCKER tellers on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 15546. An act to repeal certain portions of an act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved June 5, 1920;

H. R. 15661. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 15900. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 15901. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 12502) providing for a report on the cost of improving and maintaining the Government Boulevard on Missionary Ridge, in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the New York Legislature relating to the operation of Government-owned barges upon the New York State Canal system, which I ask may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN SENATE, STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, January 12, 1921.

By Mr. Knight:

Whereas, heretofore and during the year 1918, operation of boats, barges, and other transportation facilities on the canal system of the State was assumed by the Federal Government, with the purpose of effecting the transportation of the greatest possible tonnage thereon in aid of the carrying on of the activities of Government in time of war; and

Whereas the conditions which created the necessity for operation on such system by the Federal Government has ceased and such operation still continues; and

Whereas the canal board of the State has adopted and submitted to the legislature a resolution disapproving and opposing further continuance of such operation by the Federal Government; and

Whereas his excellency the governor of the State has this day transmitted to the legislature a message in writing recommending action by the legislature urging discontinuance of the use of the canal system of the State by the Federal Government; and

Whereas there is pending before the United States Congress a resolution introduced by Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., United States Senator for the State of New York, to restrain the Federal authorities from the use of the boats, barges, and equipment on the canal system:

Resolved (if the assembly concur). That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to adopt the said resolution introduced by the Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., and that the Federal authorities discontinue operation of barges, boats, and other transportation facilities at the earliest possible moment.

And that copies of this resolution be forthwith transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

By order of the senate:

ERNEST A. FAY, Clerk.

In assembly January 19, 1921.

Concurred in without amendment by order of the assembly.

FRED W. HAMMOND, Clerk.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I present a memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Colorado, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

House joint memorial 3, by Mr. Crouse.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, respectfully represent:

That the mining industry throughout the United States is at low ebb, production curtailed, and market prices depressed, much of which is attributable to the practically unrestricted importation of metals produced in foreign countries.

Therefore your memorialists respectfully urge the speedy passage of an act of Congress fixing a tariff upon the importation of all ores, metals, and their products which in any manner come into competition with like ore, metals, and their products produced in the United States.

It is directed that copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining in each of the Houses of Congress, and to the Members representing the State of Colorado in the United States Congress.

Mr. WARREN presented a telegram in the nature of a petition of the joint live-stock committee of the Wyoming State Legislature, of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying that an increased appropriation be made for the destruction of predatory animals, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of the Planters' Cotton & Gin Co., of Alma, Ark., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the import duty on edible oils, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions of Niotaze Grange, No. 1680, of Niotaze, Kans.; of the Oregon Grain Growers' Convention, held at The Dalles, Oreg.; and of Florida Grange, No. 306, Patrons of Husbandry, of Griffith, Colo., favoring the enactment of legislation to stop speculation in grain products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of the executive board, Michigan Federation of Labor, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the continuance of the \$240 bonus to Federal employees during the next fiscal year, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a resolution of the City Commission of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., favoring the continuance of the \$240 bonus to Federal employees during the next fiscal year, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a telegram in the nature of a petition of Local No. 17, Federal Employees' Union, of Port Huron, Mich., praying for the enactment of the so-called minimum wage bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of the Detroit Federation of Labor, of Detroit, Mich., praying that an appropriation be made for the completion of the Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a resolution of Detroit Lodge No. 82, International Association of Machinists, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the establishment of trade relations with soviet Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MAJ. GEN. E. H. CROWDER.

Mr. SPENCER. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Missouri in relation to the services of the Judge Advocate General of the Army in the World War.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI SENATE,
FIFTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January 25, 1921.

SECRETARY OF UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit to you the following concurrent resolution which has been offered into and adopted by the Senate of the Fifty-first General Assembly of Missouri, and which the House of Representatives has concurred therein:

Resolution.

Whereas as Provost Marshal General, he formulated and directed the execution of the selective service by means of which an army of about 5,000,000 men were called to the defense of their country in an almost incredibly short time and with a degree of promptness which met every need of the Nation and with comparatively no opposition from the people of this Nation so unused to military service and so devoted to the pursuits of peace; and

Whereas the ability and service of Gen. Crowder contributed in such a large measure to the successful termination of the Great War; and Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of United States a bill to promote Gen. Crowder to rank of lieutenant general; and Whereas Gen. Crowder is a native Missourian: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring therein.) That we record the appreciation and gratitude of the people of Missouri to

Gen. Crowder for his distinguished services and express our sincere desire that said bill for his promotion be passed, and that we respectfully urge the Members of Congress from Missouri to support said bill;

Resolved, That upon concurrence of the house herein, the secretary of the senate be directed to send a copy of said resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and the Chief Clerk of the National House of Representatives.

Respectfully submitted.

A. S. ZELLWEGER, Secretary of Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, submitted a report (No. 730) to accompany the bill (H. R. 9794) for the relief of Wendell Phillips Lodge, No. 365, Knights of Pythias, heretofore reported from that committee.

Mr. PHIPPS, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (S. 4899) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, I report it back favorably with amendments and submit a report (No. 726) thereon.

At this time I wish to serve notice that at the first opportunity I shall call the bill up and ask that it be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 346) extending the time for payment of purchase money on homestead entries in the former Standing Rock Indian Reservation in the States of North and South Dakota, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 727) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, submitting a report on the first named:

A bill (H. R. 178) authorizing an exchange of lands by A. A. Bruce, of La Veta, Colo. (Rept. No. 728);

A bill (H. R. 397) to authorize a lieu selection by the State of South Dakota for 160 acres on Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 5081) for the relief of James E. Adams;

A bill (H. R. 8692) authorizing the exchange of lands within the Montezuma National Forest in Colorado;

A bill (H. R. 9702) granting certain lands to the city of Sandpoint, Idaho, to protect the watershed of the water-supply system of said city; and

A bill (H. R. 13592) to authorize certain homestead settlers or entrymen who entered the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Germany to commute their entries.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12161) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 1134), reported it without amendment.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 740) for the relief of John W. Baggott, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 729) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 4939) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States," approved June 29, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4940) granting an increase of pension to John M. Herndon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for preventing and combating infestations of insects injurious to forest trees on and near the national forests, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, a day or two ago I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the National Chamber of Commerce had indorsed the bill pending in the House of Representatives and in the Senate to create a department of education, and I presented to the Senate a letter from the president of that organization in which he called attention

to the fact that the lack of education had been largely the cause of many of the worst strikes we have had. I have to-day in my hand a letter from the vice president of the Federation of Trades in which he attributes the "outlaw strikes" to the lack of education. I do not desire to take the time of the Senate to read the letter, but I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C., Thursday, January 20.]

"EDUCATION LACK, CAUSE OF 'OUTLAW STRIKE,'" SAYS MATTHEW WOLL—AMERICAN FEDERATION CHIEF TELLS WHY HIS ORGANIZATION SUPPORTS THE SMITH-TOWNER BILL—DEMANDS EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL AT LIFE'S START.

(By Matthew Woll, vice president the American Federation of Labor.)

WASHINGTON.

The issue presented in the Smith-Towner bill, which provides for a Federal department of education with a secretary in the President's Cabinet, is easily understood. There may be a difference of opinion as to whether the President's Cabinet should be enlarged, but, aside from this question, if you believe in public education, universal education, you are in principle for the bill. If you do not believe in education for the masses, or if you believe that just any education is good enough for the average American boy or girl, whose parents can not afford to send him or her to a private school, then, on principle, you are opposed to this bill.

The American Federation of Labor believes that every American boy and girl should have an equal opportunity at the start, and the American Federation has endorsed the Smith-Towner bill.

It is our boys and girls, together with the millions of children from middle-class homes in city and country, who will be its chief beneficiaries. There can be no question—our children to-day go out into the world of competition handicapped at the start both in mind and body. This is due to our national neglect of education.

The Army statistics showed this only too plainly. The Nation was amazed when it learned that hundreds of thousands of Americans, unable to read or write, had to be painfully taught the meaning of such simple commands as "halt" and "forward," and that hundreds of thousands more were rejected because of physical disabilities that might easily have been corrected in the schools.

These facts did not surprise us in the labor movement. We had known them all along. Those were "our boys," the soldiers, who in spite of physical and educational handicap that made them unfit for service in France, were yet fit enough to serve in the Army behind the Army, in steel mill and munition plant, in lumber camp and shipyard.

There is a special significance in this for Mr. Hoover's committee is now studying the question of industrial waste in an endeavor to bring about an understanding between capital and labor. Illiteracy has more to do with the so-called "outlaw strike," the question of turnover, and with accidents in industry.

Remember, please, that the rookie you saw at Camp Lee, Upton, or Funston, with his second lieutenant in the rôle of first-grade teacher, in peace time, is the operative in the silk mill, the steel plant, or the coal mine. In the "outlaw strike" he follows some fellow, no matter how irresponsible, who speaks his own language and who, because of that fact alone, naturally has his confidence. Our men, trying to bring about order, are as badly off as the young lieutenant with his awkward squad. If every workman were an educated American the path of the federation would be comparatively smooth.

As to industrial accidents, the report of Mr. Van Manning says that 1,000 miners lose their lives each year and 150,000 more are injured each year. By far the greater proportion of these accidents, he says, are due to inability of the miner to read safety warnings.

"The statistics given by the Immigration Commission," say Mr. Manning "show 620,000 foreign-born miners in this country. It is roughly estimated from the experience in certain States that about 75 per cent of these 620,000 foreign-born miners are non-English-speaking foreigners, or 465,000 immigrants with no knowledge of the English language. The best estimates from a number of the larger mining States show that foreign-born miners suffer twice the fatalities that the English-speaking miners do. This means an excess of 930 non-English-speaking foreigners killed each year, and I may say unnecessarily. If the average State compensation is \$3,000, which is a fair figure, the total economic loss each year to the country through the excess of deaths of non-English-speaking miners alone amounts to \$2,790,000. On the same basis it is estimated that the excess of non-English-speaking miners injured each year amounts to 69,750 men. This is a loss in wages alone of \$1,743,750. Taking the excess of deaths and injuries together due to non-English-speaking foreigners the economic loss each year reaches \$4,533,750. This is entirely aside from other costs to the industry in production lost."

The Smith-Towner bill authorizes Congress to appropriate \$100,000,000 for the aid to the States to be used in improving the schools, increasing teachers' salaries, promoting physical education, and Americanization and removing illiteracy, all of them national problems which we, as a Nation, can no longer afford to ignore. The enemies of the bill object to what they term this "extravagance," purposely ignoring the fact that this is only a working plan, that any Congress can give as much or as little for the promotion of these various objects. For my own part, considering our national bills for wars, past and future, even if we look at it from the militarist standpoint, that of creating fit soldiers, \$100,000,000 seems entirely too modest a sum to ask for the proper training of our children.

To those who fear that the Smith-Towner bill will give the Federal Government control over education, the fact that this bill has been given the endorsement of the American Federation of Labor ought to be sufficient assurance. The last thing that the federation desires to see is bureaucracy enthroned at Washington. As I said at the beginning, the whole thing simmers down to whether you believe in the public school or whether you don't.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I also have an editorial from the Scottish Rite Bulletin upon the same general subject. Without taking the time to read it, I ask that it also may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Are these communications supposed to be a part of the Senator's remarks?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; I present them, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD instead of taking the time of the Senate to read them, as I otherwise would do.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

There being no objection, the editorial was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANCIENT AND ACCEPTED
SCOTTISH RITE OF FREE MASONRY,
SOUTHERN JURISDICTION OF THE
UNITED STATES, ORIENT OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Aberdeen, S. Dak.

Since the 19th of May, 1919, there has been sleeping on the calendars of Congress a bill to create a department of education, with a Cabinet officer at its head, designed to systematize, coordinate, and give Federal aid to the educational activities of our country.

The expression "On the calendars of Congress" was used advisedly, for the identical measure was introduced in the Senate by HOKE SMITH, of Georgia, and in the House by HORACE TOWNER, of Iowa. It is known as the Smith-Towner bill; and, if you have not heard of it, just scan most any number of the many periodicals published in this country, but which receive their spiritual and mental (?) pabulum from a foreign country, and you will find mention of it in terms that will not be unreservedly complimentary.

The measure has no present political partisan significance, as one of its authors and sponsors is a Democrat, while the other is a Republican; but it is American to the core.

This bill carries an appropriation of \$100,000,000, annually to be apportioned: Seven million five hundred thousand dollars for the elimination of illiteracy, \$7,500,000 for Americanization, \$20,000,000 for physical education, \$15,000,000 for the preparation of teachers, and \$50,000,000 for the equalization of opportunities and partial payment of teachers' salaries.

Distribution of this amount is to be made to the several States in accordance with their scholastic and illiterate populations; and it is provided that each State is to appropriate and expend an amount equal to its quota from the Federal Government, and it is further provided that the administration and management of these educational activities shall be left to the duly constituted State authorities.

The only paternalistic features in the bill are:

First. It requires that all educational activities receiving any of the money provided in this bill shall be under the direction of the State authorities, and that the public State schools are to be the exclusive agencies through which these authorities are to work—a boost, in fact, for the American schools of our country.

Second. It requires that English shall be the basic language taught in these schools, and is to supplant all others just as fast as those in need of the instruction can discard other tongues and can absorb the lessons in the language of our country; and

Third. It requires that the State authorities charged with the administration of educational affairs under this bill shall at least annually give an account of their stewardship to the Secretary of Education, who shall compile these reports and submit them to Congress.

That any real American could possibly object to such a measure is beyond conjecture; but it is meeting with an opposition which, owing to the moral pusillanimity of Congress, will prevent its becoming law until after the oncoming election; and, unless there is an American awakening, for an indefinite period.

America needs to be Americanized, to be educated to the point where its citizenry can take an intelligent interest in its civic affairs, and above all it needs a renovation that will result in eliminating from the directorate of its civic affairs—National, State, and local—all those whose Americanism can be called in question, or whose allegiance to its flag and country permits of division with any other overlord, actual or pretended, spiritual or secular.

The Smith-Towner bill is designed to accelerate the accomplishment of this much-desired end and no un-American protestations should be permitted to bluff the membership in the Congress into allowing it to die in the hands of committees. (Scottish Rite Bulletin.)

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CALDER.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on Tuesday evening, January 25, 1921, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] delivered a most instructive and interesting address on an important subject before the Marine League in the city of New York at the Commodore Hotel. I think the speech should be preserved, and I ask permission to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR WILLIAM M. CALDER BEFORE THE MARINE LEAGUE OF NEW YORK AT THE COMMODORE HOTEL, TUESDAY EVENING, JANUARY 25, 1921.

"Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to speak on this occasion. I have always advocated the upbuilding of our merchant marine. For several terms I served as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, and since my entry into the Senate four years ago I have been a member of the Committee on Commerce, which has to do with matters affecting our ocean traffic.

"There is so much to be said concerning the subject which you have given me to discuss that one might occupy the entire evening, and I wonder where I should begin, so as to say something of interest and at the same time not to occupy too much of your time.

"I entered the Senate right after the enactment of the law which created the Shipping Board but before any appropriation

was authorized to build a merchant fleet. That came as a result of the war and the demand on the part of our allies for the construction of a tonnage sufficient to take care of our own needs and theirs. You will recall the visit here of Mr. Balfour, the British commissioner, in the early days of the war. He urged that the thing most needed to assure success was ships and more ships and still more ships. The American Nation responded to his plea.

"Many people have found fault with the President and the Shipping Board for their program, and undoubtedly both are subject to some criticism, but in the main their error was that they tried to do too much without realizing in what condition the country would be in when the war was over. When I say that we must overlook the mistakes of the war I want to add that there was one mistake which, in my mind, will ever be inexcusable, and that was the building of the wooden ships. On that colossal blunder alone we spent over \$300,000,000, nearly all of which is a total loss, and the men responsible for it can not be condemned too severely. It was a willful waste of the people's money. The policy of building wooden ships was argued against by every experienced shipbuilder and every experienced ship operator, and as yet I have never been able to understand why it was undertaken. As it turned out about 400 of the Shipping Board vessels were completed before the signing of the armistice, but if the war had lasted until the 1st of January, 1920, and we had failed to make our plans for carrying it on until that period, we might have succumbed and then all would have been lost.

"So, except for the wooden ships, I do not condemn the Shipping Board for the work which it did during the war. That is passed, but it is since the war that the Shipping Board at times has displayed great lack of business capacity.

"It has been stated many times that the Nation must accept a \$2,000,000,000 war loss or amortization on the ships constructed by the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The newspaper headlines have created the impression in the public mind that this loss was due to extravagance and graft as well as amortization, and most of our fellow citizens now have that impression. The figure is arrived at by deducting from the total cost a sum which various people now believe to be the sales value of the ships.

"This conception is not entirely true, because it does not take into consideration the profits which have been earned by the use of these same ships and ignores the extra national wealth which we have derived from our foreign commerce during the last three years and which could not have been obtained had it not been for the existence of these ships.

"The extra cost, therefore, of the Emergency Fleet ships should be charged against peace profits as well as a war loss.

"The net cost of the 1,696 steel ships produced by the Emergency Fleet Corporation, after deducting items which are purely war expenditures, is \$2,575,700,000. The tonnage involved is 11,660,000. This figure is arrived at as follows:

The estimated cost of the completion of the whole program is about.....	\$3,300,000,000
Cancellations are estimated to cost.....	\$170,000,000
Net cost of wood ships about.....	310,000,000
Yards, dry docks, and marine railways.....	148,000,000
Transportation and housing.....	76,800,000
Concrete ships.....	20,000,000
	<hr/> 724,300,000

Net cost of 1,696 ships of 11,660,000 dead-weight tonnage about.....	2,575,700,000
About \$220 per dead-weight ton.	

"The net cost should be further reduced by an amount at present unascertainable, which has been repaid to the Government through Federal taxation out of the very same money which was used in constructing the ships. Ascertainment of this figure could only be made by examining the returns not only of shipbuilding companies but of boiler, engine, and other supply manufacturers.

"The foreign commerce of the United States for 1918, 1919, and the first 11 months of 1920, as officially reported, is as follows:

EXPORTS.	
1918.....	\$6,149,087,545
1919.....	7,920,425,990
1920 (11 months).....	7,507,323,420
Total.....	<hr/> 21,576,836,955
IMPORTS.	
1918.....	\$3,031,212,710
1919.....	3,904,364,932
1920 (11 months).....	5,013,117,932
Total.....	<hr/> 11,948,695,574
Grand total.....	<hr/> 33,525,532,529

"Comparison of these stupendous figures with the amount of our commerce before the creation of the Emergency Fleet Cor-

poration shows very startling increases. The portion of this commerce moved in Emergency Fleet ships is very great, but no accurate figures are ascertainable, because until the end of the war the Government controlled all shipping to Europe, our greatest market, and operated its own ships and those the use of which it had requisitioned from private owners, as a unit. But the proportion, particularly of the exports, actually moved in Emergency Fleet ships was necessarily large, because all of the ships, as fast as they were created, were kept constantly full of cargo until a few months ago.

"Seeing that we had only a trifling merchant marine before 1918, and seeing that the tonnage of other nations was so continuously occupied in their own commerce as to preclude the possibility of moving any considerable portion of our commerce during most of the period above stated, there can be no question that if we had not had these ships we could not have had the commerce.

"If we had not had these ships, these would have been some of the results:

"First. There would have been an absolute curtailment of production immediately after the armistice and there would have been dumped on our markets the accumulated surpluses of our manufactures and our agriculture.

"Second. The Nation would have lost substantially the gross amount of the sales of our excesses, because they could not have been transported.

"Third. If this curtailment had taken place immediately after the armistice, when 5,000,000 men were coming out of the uniform and trying to get back into civilian life, we should have had unemployment on such a huge scale that social and political crises would have been immediate and serious, and these crises would have come at a time when radical ideas would have been much more difficult to combat than they are at the present time. We have been given a breathing spell and an opportunity to readjust our affairs in an orderly way.

"Fourth. Europe is having a most serious time in working back to normal. Had it not had the very great assistance of our food and manufactures, it is safe to say that several of the great European Governments would no longer be in existence, because in critical times food is an important political factor.

"Fifth. We should have lost trade opportunities which, notwithstanding our almost complete inexperience, have been developed by our aggressive citizens very greatly.

"Sixth. We should have lost the opportunity to instruct thousands of our men in foreign commerce, which is the most intricate of all business.

"In view of these tremendous advantages which we have acquired simply because we had these ships, it is perfectly reasonable to charge at least the difference between war cost and prewar cost against the benefits and profits derived. Indeed, so great have been these benefits—and they are still continuing—that it would be justifiable for Congress to consider the entire cost of the Emergency Fleet as either already offset by the profits or as being in a very fair way to be offset in the next very few years.

"The situation is very analogous to the conditions which confronted some of the large retail dry goods establishments here in New York not so many years ago. Some of the greatest of these did not have their own delivery wagons. They depended on the Merchants' Express, a separate corporation, which owned the wagons and levied a service charge for delivering the materials sold by the department stores. With comparatively little warning, the Merchants' Express went out of business, and it was then necessary for each department store to acquire its own wagons. Obviously, each store had to acquire a fleet of wagons immediately. Otherwise all of its business, with the exception of the portion conducted on the "cash-and-carry" basis, would have ceased.

"Let us assume that a few years later, after the department stores had enjoyed an era of unprecedented sales, some accountant or appraiser had come along and estimated what he considered to be the sales value of the delivery wagons, and, after deducting that value from the original cost, insisted that the difference was an emergency loss and should be considered as a loss without any reference whatever to the profits that had been made possible only by the existence of the fleet of delivery wagons. Certainly the executives would never have taken such a view of the situation.

"The whole question is merely a bookkeeping worry. There is no question that the national wealth has been tremendously increased by the use of these ships. We have a great new national asset just as vital to the continuance of our national life, our industries and our agriculture, and nearly as important for our protection in time of war as the United States Navy. We might just as well say that there is an enormous loss in the Navy because its sales value is less than its cost.

"Therefore, the Emergency Fleet has not merely served the purpose for which it was created—to wit, to assist in winning the war—but has likewise served to develop our foreign commerce as no other instrumentality ever has developed any foreign commerce of any nation in history.

"The people have been looking entirely on the dark side of the picture—the alleged losses—and have not looked on the bright side—the very real and tangible profits.

"I believe the aid necessary to assure the successful operation of American ships in the overseas trade is contained in the shipping act of 1920 provided it is properly interpreted. We can not ask the American ship operator to purchase Shipping Board vessels at \$225 per ton and operate them successfully in competition with foreign ships which cost less than \$100 per ton. These vessels should be disposed of at a price not exceeding what they can be constructed for to-day.

"They should be sold as speedily as possible to American owners under fair conditions and until disposed of should be chartered under terms that will be fair to the Government and to the operator as well. Many ships have been sold by the Shipping Board at high prices, and to-day the men who purchased them are unable to carry out their contracts. Where these conditions exist ship-sale contracts should be modified. It would be a great deal better to reduce the prices at which these vessels were sold originally if satisfactory security can be obtained to assure their being finally paid for. I am for an American merchant marine owned and operated by Americans in the interest of the American laborer, the American farmer, and the American manufacturer, and I am willing to go a very long way to assure its success. I know too well that if we permit this fleet to be dissipated it will be of incalculable disadvantage to the American who is trying to retain his export business. We can not hope to permanently carry on that business which was created during and since the war unless we can carry it in American vessels, and while the cost of operating American vessels in the foreign trade may be greater than like tonnage under a foreign flag, it must be maintained, and I believe under the shipping act recently passed it can be; but if a fair trial of that law indicates that further legislation must be enacted to assure this being done, then such legislation must be secured.

"I have heard men say that they were exceedingly doubtful as to whether or not it was possible for us to maintain a merchant marine under any circumstances; that during the past 60 years we have directed our attention to other lines of endeavor where profits were more certain. We have passed a seamen's law governing the operation of ships flying the American flag, and we are conducting our shipping business on a scale which makes it difficult for us to cope with England and the other maritime nations of Europe.

"I can not convey much new information to this audience, as shipping has not been my life business, as it has been yours, and I venture the statement that every man in this room knows more about the subject than I do, but with shipping laws and wage conditions as they are to-day we can not operate our merchant fleet without some form of Government aid or encouragement, and unless this encouragement is forthcoming it is only a matter of time when we will be driven off the seas. It seems to me the shipping law of 1920 furnishes the necessary assistance, and when business becomes normal again, then, with the courage and enterprise of the American who is trained in the overseas trade, I am confident we will continue to carry the products of the American farm and factory in American vessels to the uttermost corners of the world. During and since the war the business of building ships and of operating them drifted into the hands of many men without any previous training or experience, who for a few months made abnormal profits, but when business conditions slackened many went into the hands of receivers. These men have done great harm, for they created a bad impression in the minds of the American people, an impression which to remove will take the greatest amount of courage and the very best of cooperation before confidence can be again restored. The American business man has got to understand that if we hope to maintain our foreign trade against the competition of the rest of the world we have got to carry that foreign trade in ships flying the American flag.

"The United States has lacked a definite reconstruction program. When the war was on we gave no thought to the days that were to follow. We had no program for the operation of our ships or railroads, for the supervision and encouragement of our housing industry, or, in fact, for the rehabilitation of business generally.

"Men who made fabulous sums during the war and in the months that followed apparently believed that the golden stream would go on forever. We have concentrated our energy since the armistice in the main in the production of consumables and

gave no thought to the construction of railroads, terminals, or housing for the people. During the last governmental fiscal year the credits of our banks were extended \$6,000,000,000, and in all probability the entire sum was utilized for trading purposes rather than for the creation of the things that have lasting value.

"I have struggled during the past six months in an effort to bring to the attention of our citizens the problem of providing homes for the people. I regret exceedingly to say that apparently I have failed to make an impression so far on Congress as to the Nation's needs in this regard. All of the European countries are to-day struggling with their housing difficulties, and these countries are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to secure homes for their citizens. I have tried to bring this situation forcibly to the attention of Congress so that we might forestall a popular demand for governmental construction of homes. Not a single thing has been done, so far as I know, in an effort to remove the handicaps under which the building industry is now struggling. In New York and many other States laws have been passed designed to prevent profiteering by landlords. These laws were undoubtedly necessary, but their enactment, with their many restrictive provisions, have had the effect of discouraging the erection of apartments and tenements which are urgently needed.

"We have been procrastinating in adopting remedies to meet the critical situation in the building industry. Some are inclined to let the whole matter take care of itself, but personally I am much concerned for the future.

"I speak of these things to-night not in the spirit of pessimism but more with the idea of trying to drive home to this audience the great necessity of American business men applying themselves at once to the solution of these most difficult matters. From the men in this room we have a right to expect a solution of our shipping questions. There are times when we need a setback to bring home the need of action, and I am sure that from the present depression we will enter upon a new era in American shipping.

"The very same thing applies to our port facilities in New York. The boroughs of Manhattan and Brooklyn have all to gain by a broad-minded policy with regard to port development. In the expansion of the physical plant to accommodate more commerce, the banking and merchandising center of lower Manhattan will profit greatly through the administration and financing of increased business. To have an adequate physical plant to take care of the demands for transportation made upon the port of New York requires the rational development of all the water front around the bay. If these demands for adequate port and terminal facilities are not provided for, business will be forced to go elsewhere, as has been the case to an alarming degree in recent months.

"It is an interesting fact that before the war 50 per cent of the foreign trade of the United States passed through this port, but during the past year this has been reduced to 38 per cent. The business men of New York have the responsibility of seeing to it that everything possible is done to maintain the city of New York as the great seaport of the country. Recently in a speech in the city of Washington a distinguished Senator intimated that the British interests here were dominant. We know that when the Senator made that statement he was in error. This is an American port and the interests of our country are preeminent here, and in the harbor to-day flies the flag of every maritime nation of the world, and all of them are welcome.

"It is up to us to work out a solution of the port's needs. There is no excuse for the conditions which I have described. We have become not only the metropolis of the western world but the greatest city on the face of the earth and the greatest that ever existed, and here, more than in any other place, ideal shipping conditions should be maintained. It is the business of our chamber of commerce, our merchants' association, and our board of trade, our maritime association, and of your organization to aid in relieving the present deplorable situation. You should not leave it to Gov. Miller or the mayor of your city or even Senator CALDER. Too often we make these matters of harbor development a butt for political manipulation. I do not believe that this city lacks the spirit to take hold of our port and terminal and warehouse situation and improve it.

"But, Mr. Toastmaster, I have talked too long already. I have enjoyed this evening immensely. We have here the very best of the business men of our city, the men who are to solve this difficult problem for us and men who will bring back to our city and our Nation the prosperity which should be theirs. In Washington, most of us are alive to the immediate needs of the people in the matters which I have discussed. We want your help; we want your advice; and we want your counsel in

solving the great matters of the adjustment of our revenue laws which is to be taken up for consideration immediately after the new administration takes office. We are to have a new tariff law and a new revenue law. In passing these laws we must not forget that America is no longer a debtor to Europe, but is now the great creditor Nation of the world. We must not forget either in the enactment of tariff or revenue laws that the country will stand just so much taxes, and that when they exceed the sum that the business of the Nation can bear then indeed the trend must be downward. I am sure that in the enactment of these laws Congress, with its understanding of the Nation's need, will place on the statute books measures which will restore confidence in the minds of the people and assure the future welfare of the country."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 15546. An act to repeal certain portions of an act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved June 5, 1920;

H. R. 15661. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 15900. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 15901. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE FOR FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of having a bill passed, to which I think there will be no objection. If there should be any objection, I will withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business has been laid aside; it was laid aside yesterday, and there is nothing now before the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say briefly that under the language of the water power act the Comptroller of the Treasury has held that the commission can not employ clerical help in the District of Columbia, so that all the help that the commission can get to enable them to carry out the provisions of the act is by detail from the various departments. The bill is for the purpose of giving the commission the power to employ clerical help, but it can not employ such help until expressly authorized by Congress to do so. The power is retained in Congress absolutely to fix the number of employees and their salaries. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. It is Senate bill 4640, Order of Business No. 681 on the calendar. The bill is short, and I ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The reading clerk read the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, as follows:

A bill (S. 4640) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, is hereby amended by adding thereto an additional paragraph as follows:

"The commission, if it is unable to perform the duties imposed upon it by this act through and by means of employees of the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture as provided in the second paragraph of this section, is hereby authorized to employ in the District of Columbia and elsewhere such additional expert, technical, clerical, and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of performing the duties imposed by this act and as may be from time to time appropriated for by Congress. The detail of persons for such purpose from the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture, or the transfer from such departments of any persons engaged in duties which by this act are conferred upon the commission, is hereby authorized."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does that complete the reading of the bill, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does, except the amendments which have been reported by the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington what has become of the bill to amend the water power act so that it shall not apply to national parks?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have been trying to get that bill up several times, but have not yet had an opportunity to do so. I am going to take advantage of the first opportunity which presents itself for bringing the bill up.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was going to suggest to the Senator that the unfinished business is not now before the Senate, there is no other business before the Senate, and now might be a very opportune time to ask for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But I know that I can not get unanimous consent to have the bill taken up.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think it requires unanimous consent just now to have the bill taken up.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not disposed to move to take up the bill at this time.

FORCIBLE ENTRY AND DETAINER.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 4746, Order of Business 630.

Mr. PENROSE. What is the bill, Mr. President?

Mr. BORAH. It is a very important bill, relating to the question of the rent law in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMOOT. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. PENROSE. I must object, Mr. President, to taking up any other bills. It is generally understood in the Senate that we are to-day to proceed with the so-called emergency tariff bill; it is before the Senate, and I hope that we shall now proceed with the consideration of that measure, and that Senators who address the Senate will, so far as possible and reasonable, confine themselves to the measure under consideration.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I had myself supposed that we were going to consider the emergency tariff bill, but I observed, I thought, a disposition to allow the consideration of a few bills. I therefore took advantage of the situation. If there is going to be objection, of course, I have nothing to say, but if bills are going to be permitted to be considered, I naturally feel, in common with other Senators, that the bill in which I am interested should have an opportunity for consideration.

Mr. PENROSE. There were a few Senators with small bills which it was represented to me were of such extraordinary merit that I yielded in order that they might be considered; but I think that time has now elapsed and that I ought to insist on the resumption of the consideration of the emergency tariff bill.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, may I inquire of my colleague if at the time of the recess last night there was not an understanding that we should have a reasonable opportunity this morning to present bills that would not provoke discussion?

Mr. PENROSE. I do not know of any such general understanding. If my colleague has some short bill that will not lead to discussion, I will not be unreasonable.

Mr. KNOX. I have a measure, for the consideration of which I asked unanimous consent on yesterday, that I do not think will lead to any discussion. It is designed merely by way of amendment to correct an error in the trading with the enemy act.

Mr. PENROSE. I suggest to the Senator that perhaps next week, when the Post Office appropriation bill or some other appropriation bill is under consideration, he may have a good opportunity to bring his bill up.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, the RECORD of the proceedings at the close of last evening reads:

If during the day to-morrow there are Senators who have bills they want passed immediately, I shall not object; but to-day, it seems to me, I have no authority to do anything but move to take a recess.

I was acting on my colleague's representation; otherwise I would not have made the effort again after having failed yesterday.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the bill which my colleague has in mind lead to any discussion?

Mr. KNOX. If it shall, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. PENROSE. If the bill will not lead to any discussion and can be passed immediately, of course, I will not object.

Mr. KNOX. I do not understand that I have the floor as against the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania is distributing the time, and as he has distributed it to his colleague, I make no objection.

Mr. PENROSE. I understood that the Senator from Idaho had a measure which would lead to prolonged discussion.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think so; the bill is upon the very verge of being passed; the amendments have been agreed to; the bill has passed from the consideration as in Committee of the

Whole into the Senate; no amendments have been offered in the Senate, and the bill has been read the third time, but at that point some remarks were made upon it by a Senator. However, I shall not interfere with the bill of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. I do not wish to take advantage of the courtesy of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to say to the Senator from Idaho that I have been assured by several Senators that his bill will lead to very considerable and prolonged discussion. If it will not lead to such discussion, and he will be willing to withdraw it if it does, I shall not object.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator has such assurance from Senators who are now upon the floor, of course that ends it.

Mr. PENROSE. I have been informed this morning by Senators now on the floor that the bill will lead to discussion.

Mr. BORAH. Very well; I will accept the Senator's statement.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I understand the emergency tariff bill is before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is not before the Senate; it was laid aside yesterday.

Mr. PENROSE. Then I ask that the bill may be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. PENROSE. Now I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily in order that my colleague may call up the measure which he desires to have considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT.

Mr. KNOX. I am greatly indebted to my colleague for his kindness. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4897) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (3) of subsection (b) of section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended, be, and hereby is, amended so as to read as follows:

"(3) A woman who, at the time of her marriage, was a citizen of the United States (such citizenship having been acquired either by birth in the United States or by birth elsewhere of American parents citizens of the United States), and who, prior to April 6, 1917, intermarried with a subject or citizen of Germany or Austria-Hungary, and that the money or other property concerned was not acquired by such woman either directly or indirectly from any subject or citizen of Germany or Austria-Hungary; or."

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, this proposed amendment of the act of 1917 involves a single and simple point. The act by which we required the Alien Property Custodian to return to American women who had married alien enemies the property seized by the Alien Property Custodian contained the words "American women born in the United States," overlooking the fact that a woman born of American citizens temporarily residing abroad is just as much a citizen of the United States as if she were born within the United States. All that this amendment does is to add to the word "born" the words "or born of American citizens abroad."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether it was not understood, when we passed the act to which the Senator refers, that the word "born" would have a broader meaning than that which has just been attributed to it by the Senator from Pennsylvania. Was it not understood that it would include those persons who were born on foreign soil, but whose parents were temporarily absent from the United States?

Mr. KNOX. That was the obvious purpose of the law; but the Alien Property Custodian has raised the question whether he can go outside of the letter of the law, and he is in favor of the passage of this bill.

I might just state what a remarkably ridiculous situation this law puts American women in. The wife of Count von Bernstorff was an American woman, and under the law as it exists to-day her property is to be returned, and probably has been already returned; but the daughter of Henry White, American ambassador abroad, and who was serving his country at the time of

the birth of that daughter, can not have her property returned because she was born outside of the United States. Of course it is hornbook law that the children of American citizens temporarily residing abroad, whether on business or pleasure or in the service of their country, are just as much American citizens as those who are born within our borders.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am sure it was the purpose of the Senate and the Judiciary Committee with respect to the other measure that it should include the case to which the Senator has just referred; and it seems to me that the department or the agencies of the Government have placed too narrow an interpretation upon that act.

Mr. KNOX. It can do no harm to correct the law.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator. May I not suggest that this might be an appropriate time to consider the question of restoring to German nationals the property which was sequestered by the United States after we entered the war, and which is in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. KNOX. I am ready to cooperate with the Senator from Utah on that subject.

Mr. KING. I have prepared a bill, but it has not been introduced, which, under certain restrictions and subject to certain limitations and exceptions, would restore to German nationals the property which the Government sequestered. I think this subject should be considered at an early date, if we are not to ratify the Versailles treaty. However, I shall not discuss that question now or present my views upon the matter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I am sorry I can not agree with my friend to the left and my friend to the right about the return of this property, and I do not want to let this occasion go by without entering some protest.

So far as the present bill is concerned, I have no objection to it. I realize that American women who married German husbands had their property here placed in a very unfortunate position. Their homes and their families were here. It was not a condition to which the Government of the United States desired to chain them. I also realize that when we adopted that resolution, by inadvertence or otherwise we did not take care of the particular situation, applicable to a very few persons, which the Senator from Pennsylvania by his amendment now seeks to cure.

As I say, I have no objection to the passage of this bill; but I do seriously object to the statement that we should return to German nationals property taken by the Alien Property Custodian during the war. That was an act of war. It was done by other Governments; but, more than that, I think that any Government should hold its first allegiance to its own people and not to a foreign people. The property of American citizens was ruthlessly destroyed, taken, and confiscated during the war by the German Government.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Has unanimous consent been given for the consideration of this measure?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Was it not with the understanding that it would not create discussion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair knows nothing of any unanimous-consent agreement of that kind.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understood that the Senator in charge of the tariff bill—

Mr. PENROSE. My understanding was that my colleague would withdraw the bill if it should lead to any discussion.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I happen to have the floor. I do not often occupy the floor. In connection with the discussion of the tariff bill I do not think I have occupied it for two minutes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to object to the consideration of the bill, if it is proper to make the objection at this time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sorry what I am saying does not meet with the approval of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber; but, as I have the floor, I propose to finish what I am saying. The Senator from Pennsylvania will not have an opportunity to withdraw his bill until I take my seat, and then he will have an opportunity to take floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not make this inquiry because I was objecting to what the Senator had to say—not at all. That never occurred to me. It was simply with the idea that we should proceed with the tariff bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am perfectly willing to proceed with the tariff bill, and I have no desire to delay that measure. So far as I am personally concerned, I hope by Monday to be able

to make a speech on the bill myself, and then I shall be ready to vote on it; but what I am saying now is not said for delay.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I hope the Senator did not think I thought anything of that kind. My understanding was, when the suggestion was made a moment ago to lay aside the tariff bill, that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania would ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill he called up, and that it would be given on the understanding arrived at that there would be no discussion on that bill. That was the sole reason why I asked the question. I know the Senator stated the other day that he was not going to make any captious opposition to the tariff bill, and I know he meant it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not going to, and I am not saying this in the way of captious opposition to the tariff bill.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. I do not want to be placed in a false position. I do not know whether I can withdraw this measure from the consideration of the Senate or not, but the Senators are entirely correct when they state that when I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill I said I would withdraw it if it provoked discussion; and I would withdraw it now, if I had the power, if I thought the Senator from Alabama meant to speak very long.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that the other Senators who have tried to interpret what I am doing have already taken up more time than I intend to take up in my statement on the subject if I am allowed to proceed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a moment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to say that when the Senator finishes I wish to express a view entirely different from that which seems to be indicated as the position of the Senator from Alabama; and I do not think the bill ought to be withdrawn, after he presents the view that this property might properly be held, without presenting the other view—that the property belongs to these individuals, and can not be fairly and honestly used in any way except to return it to its real owners.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, that is the Senator's viewpoint; but that viewpoint has been expressed a good many times, and I want to express my viewpoint on this subject as emphatically as I can.

I am as much responsible for the taking over of this property from German citizens, and the proposal to keep it, as any other man in the Senate, because I proposed the amendment to an appropriation bill for the confiscation of the property. I thought then that it was a proper war measure, and I believe so now. I think it was one of the most effective war measures that was adopted by the Congress to enable us to win the war; but here is the point I am coming to, and I only desire to occupy a few moments in saying it:

We have a billion dollars' worth of claims of American citizens filed with the State Department for property taken and confiscated by the German Government; and the only opportunity we have for securing the payment of those claims is out of this property taken by the Alien Property Custodian. It was agreed to in the treaty of Versailles, and the Germans have consented to pay their own nationals for the property we have taken and to allow us to take this property and pay our nationals for the injury done by the German Government and its citizens. Now, it seems to me it would be a rank piece of discrimination against our own people, and in favor of the late enemy, for us to say that we are going to surrender back this property; and, more than that, I do not think the gentlemen who are advocating the surrender of this property back to German citizens have carefully investigated the question before them.

This matter has been worked out and settled in the treaty of Versailles. You may say that we are not a party to the treaty of Versailles, and we are not, and probably never will be now. Nevertheless, the title to this property comes from Germany, and under her agreement in the treaty of Versailles it is settled, and it is settled on the basis that it shall be used to pay our citizens for the property lost and destroyed by German action to the extent of those claims; and in the event that it is not all used up for that purpose it shall go as a reparation claim to England and France for the losses of their property.

That is the German agreement with England and France; and if we are going to surrender our rights to this property I think we will find ourselves with the claim on the part of the English and the French Governments that they have rights involved in

this matter, and that we are surrendering the title to property to pay the nationals of some other nation.

I know, of course, that that is not directly involved in this bill. I have no objection to the bill; but I do not think the time has come when, out of a desire to please some of our American citizens who have relatives in Germany, out of a matter of politics, we should start out to surrender the rights of our own citizens. There is not a Senator here, I take it, who has not filed in the State Department the claims of his own constituency, who must go unpaid if we are to pursue the policy of returning to citizens of Germany this property that we took as a war measure, and that has been recognized by the German Government.

Of course, I know it is not involved here, but I just wanted to submit that this can not be done by unanimous consent; that although there may be a large number of Senators who are prepared to surrender, the United States Senate is not unanimous on that subject.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I do not regard the return of alien enemy property to its owners as a matter of politics, and it should not be considered from the standpoint of pleasing the people of any State. I regard it as a matter of duty which rests upon our Government.

When a nation invites foreigners to invest their money within its borders, the nation then becomes in a sense trustee for the property, and the obligation rests upon the nation to protect that property. While in the case of war the property can be sequestered for the purpose of guarding against its use by the enemy, yet at the close of the war the obligation rests upon the nation sequestering the property to return it to its owners.

The property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian belonged, at the time it was sequestered, to certain individuals, and we have no right as a Nation to deprive them of it or to divert it to some other use. It still belongs to those who owned it at the time it was seized by the Alien Property Custodian, and the obligation rests upon our Government, as a matter of good faith, to return it to them. No matter how meritorious may be the claims against the German Government, to use the property of a few individuals because they were Germans, to pay a liability of the German Government, when that property was invested in our country with the consent of our Government would be a breach of good faith.

This principle was announced in an early treaty made with Prussia, prepared, I believe, by Mr. Franklin. It was presented to the Prussian Government by Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson. It was reasserted in the treaty of 1824 with Prussia, and this last treaty has been treated by the German Government and our Government as extending to the entire German Empire. It amounts to a treaty obligation to these Germans, whose property is now in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, to return to them as individuals their property at the close of the war.

Our Government has led the nations of the world in seeking to mitigate the horrors of war by preserving to the individual his property against the devastation of war. We have led the world in teaching it. We have gone even further and we have insisted that property of private citizens upon the ocean should be safe from enemy confiscation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I recognize that the Senator is presenting a humanitarian and a charitable view and I am not one of those who want to crush the man who is down, but I believe first in justice to our own people. How are the American citizens whose property was destroyed by a ruthless German Government during the war to get a settlement of their claims if we are to turn this property back to the German citizens?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is a pertinent question. Our citizens should receive justice from the German Government, but the liability is by the German Government to them, and this liability of the German Government would not excuse the United States from doing injustice to a few German citizens. In our treaty with Germany we should demand and require, right alongside of any other indemnity, compensation to our own citizens from the German Government.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. How are they to get it? We can not get Germany to pay for the keep of the American soldiers on the Rhine, who are there under an armistice agreement as a first charge against the nation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We ought to have taken care of our rights in this respect in the treaty, and we still ought to do so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If we had ratified the treaty of Versailles, it would have been taken care of.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There can not be any question about it.
 Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not agree with the Senator.
 Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will read the treaty of Versailles—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have read it.
 Mr. UNDERWOOD. He will see that it plainly says that this property taken by the Alien Property Custodian shall be used in the payment of claims of American citizens. Is that not true?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think the German Government has the right to give away the property of its citizens here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the Senator will find that that is a new announcement of international law. That a government can not control the rights of its own nationals is a new announcement of international law which I have not heretofore heard advanced.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think we could make an agreement with the German Government to subject the property of individuals to a liability for which the German Government is responsible without being guilty of a breach of trust on our own part. When we open our doors for investments by foreign citizens in time of peace, they confide their property to the faith of our Government and laws, and it would be a breach of good faith by our Government to confiscate their property on account of controversies between the two nations, and it would be a violation of trust reposed in us to divert the property from its owners.

The proper way to protect our citizens is to require reparation from all of Germany to meet their losses, and not to simply take the property of a few Germans to meet the responsibility of their Government. The owners of this property trusted this property to us, and invested their money in the United States under our laws, having faith in us as a Nation to protect them in their property rights, and having faith in the treaty which we had made with Germany, by which we had agreed to protect them in their property rights even in case of war. They had a right to believe we would live up to the obligation.

I agree with the view presented by Mr. Hamilton in his celebrated Camillus letter supporting the Jay treaty with Great Britain. The German citizens, whose property is now in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, have a right to expect us sacredly to protect the trust confided in us. Not only under the treaty with Prussia, which has been extended by our Government and the Government of Germany to all of Germany, but under established rules of international law not disregarded during the past 100 years, the property of an alien enemy upon land can not be confiscated, and for it to be taken to be used for any purpose except to return it to its owners would be confiscation.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have always listened with rapt attention not only to the wonderful range of knowledge of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], but especially to his facility of expression. That admiration grew into an almost boundless wonder yesterday when that Senator for nearly five long hours discussed the emergency tariff bill without once referring to the bill or to a single item in it. May I hope, Mr. President, that in the discussion of the subject to-day we may hear something about the bill itself, even though it may be in opposition thereto.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, of course I am expected to regard the remarks made by the Senator as complimentary. The Senator is somewhat in error. I did discuss the tariff and certain fundamental principles relating to the subject. I called attention to the fact that our prosperity depends upon our foreign commerce, and also to the fact that the Senator from North Dakota upon a number of occasions had advocated policies which if carried into effect would increase our exports and imports.

I called attention to the comprehensive tariff bill which I understood was to be enacted when the Republicans would control all branches of the Government, and referred to the Payne-Aldrich bill, the Dingley and McKinley bills, and other measures drawn in the interest of protected industries, and in the interest of the few instead of the many, and I predicted that our Republican friends in that bill would resurrect the dead forms of the past and endeavor to revitalize them. I discussed the effect of tariff upon our trade and commerce and upon the

prosperity of the country, and ventured to inquire whether the Senator believed that prohibitory tariff laws would tend to promote trade and commerce and enable the United States to maintain her primacy in the financial and economic world and promote the welfare of the American people. I discussed for a considerable portion of the time I had the floor questions pertinent to the measure now before the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; Mr. President, I appreciate that the Senator did talk about the tariff bill that is to be introduced at the next session of Congress; but I was waiting all day in the hope that the Senator would discuss the pending bill, and especially that portion of it relating to the wool item, because I have great confidence in his ability to discuss that feature of it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before proceeding to a discussion of the question which I desire to bring before the Senate for consideration this morning, I shall briefly comment upon the statement just made by the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. He has expressed approval of a cloture rule for the Senate. I respectfully dissent from his position. In my opinion it would be unwise and inimical to the best interest of the States and the Government itself were a cloture rule to be adopted in the Senate of the United States.

The Senator has mentioned a number of so-called filibusters which resulted in either delaying or defeating certain proposed legislation. I think a dispassionate review of the few instances in which unlimited debate defeated measures under consideration will furnish convincing proof that no harm was suffered by the country, and, indeed, good resulted therefrom. The Force bill was defeated because of the freedom of debate permitted in the Senate. Upon a few occasions improvident measures have failed to pass because of the absence of a cloture rule, but I believe that public opinion justified the opposition to such measures.

I feel sanguine that a careful examination of the record of the two Houses of Congress will demonstrate that the Senate passes substantially as many bills as does the House. The previous question, which prevails in the House and which limits debate, has not, in my opinion, resulted in the passage of more important legislation by the House than by the Senate. Some measures are debated in the Senate until the subjects are worn threadbare, and often extraneous questions are considered, and yet the record of legislative achievement on the part of the Senate is remarkable and measures up to the accomplishments of the House.

There is another point, however, to be considered. The value of a legislative body to the country does not depend solely upon the number of bills which it passes. Students of our legislative history and of the activities of the States are practically unanimous in the view that the people suffer from too much rather than from too little legislation. Ponderous volumes of statutes like a perennial stream flow from the printing establishments of our country. Then, in addition to the laws of Congress and the States, there are municipalities and other State political subdivisions constantly passing ordinances, resolutions, and regulatory decrees affecting the lives and property of the people; but that is not all. There are thousands of Federal and State agencies, commissions, boards, bureaus, and departments that fill the land with their orders, regulations, rules, and pronouncements, and all of these ordinances, rules, and regulations are backed by penal provisions, and their infraction is attended by pains and penalties.

Though there is unlimited debate in the Senate, when the time arrives to consider and act upon important measures action is taken, and the record will disclose, as I have stated, that the Senate does not fail in dealing with measures of public interest and which provide legislation imperatively needed by the people.

Mr. President, the Senate is the body in which the sovereign States are represented, and Senators are the ambassadors and representatives of those sovereign States. They are here to speak for them in their sovereign capacity, as well as for the people within the States. In this forum there should be no shackling of the States or their representatives.

Mr. President, a few days ago I obtained the floor for the purpose of submitting a few words concerning the steps which I regarded as necessary to be taken in order that our foreign commerce might be developed. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] interrupted me and discussed at considerable length the economic conditions in Russia. If I correctly understood his position he condemned the Russian policy of the United States and the refusal of the administration to deal with the soviet dictatorship, and expatiated upon the resources of Russia and the advantages which would be derived if the United States would enter into trade relations and agreements with Russia.

He contended that there were obstacles interposed by the United States which prevented Americans from visiting Russia or from entering into commercial relations with the Russian

people, and asserted that other nations, particularly Great Britain, were carrying on extensive trade operations with the Russian people.

His statements were so broad and the matters to which he referred were so numerous that it was impossible for me during the limited time at my disposal to make reply. Weeks ago an agreement had been reached for a vote upon the packers' bill the following day. A number of Senators desired to offer and discuss important amendments to the bill, and were also desirous of presenting their views upon that important measure. It was therefore impossible for me to continue the discussion of Russian questions, and I, therefore, upon yielding the floor announced that as soon as opportunity was afforded, following the disposition of the packers' bill, I would submit to the Senate some observations upon the questions raised by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to suggest to him, however, that that joint resolution is not before the Senate; that the matter before the Senate now is the emergency tariff bill? I have so much confidence in the good judgment of the Senator from Utah, as I have listened to him on many occasions in the discussion of matters before the Senate, I hope before he gets through he will discuss the wool proposition in the tariff bill, as he comes from a State in which a great deal of wool is raised.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I appreciate the kindness of the Senator from North Dakota in reminding me of the fact that we are now considering the so-called emergency tariff bill. I confess that for the moment that fact had escaped me. Let me add, however, that I gave notice of my purpose to reply to the Senator from Maryland before the pending bill was laid before the Senate for consideration. It is not my intention to delay consideration of the measure before us or a final vote upon its passage. But having yielded the floor when I might have retained it, to facilitate action upon an important bill, I feel that I should have opportunity to continue the discussion precipitated by a Senator upon the other side of the Chamber. The Russian question is an important one, and it involves indirectly if not directly the question of trade and commerce.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Gooding in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Arizona? Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I have so much admiration for the high character of the Senator from Utah and my other colleagues on this side that I am emboldened to say they are making a tactical blunder. I try to practice directness—

Mr. KING. I do not yield to the Senator to make a speech. If he wants to ask a question, I shall willingly yield. Time is precious, and I can not yield to the Senator to make a speech in my time.

Mr. ASHURST. I suggest, in the form of a question, that it would become those who are opposed to the emergency tariff bill, manfully, frankly, and firmly to say to its advocates: "You shall not pass it." Then no time would be wasted in trying to pass the bill. I am for this emergency bill. I believe the time has arrived—

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator said he would ask me a question. He has heretofore announced that he is for this measure.

Mr. ASHURST. I have consumed but 10 minutes in this entire session.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah declines to yield.

Mr. KING. And if the Senator assumes such a militant attitude, I shall decline to yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I hope the Senator will not do that.

Mr. KING. I am disarmed. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I believe the time has arrived when some person of directness who says "No" when he means no and "Yes" when he means yes shall rise and with a little courage, just a little courage, say, "Gentlemen of the Republican side, you shall not pass this bill." Then no longer would valuable time be wasted.

My learned friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] rose this morning and said it has been insinuated that there is a filibuster. Insinuated? I charge it. I do not insinuate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to correct him? My statement was that when the unanimous-consent agreement was offered there was an insinuation made then.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not insinuate; I charge a filibuster—

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I decline to yield. The Senator has transgressed the proprieties which should have governed

him when I courteously yielded to him that he might propound a question.

Mr. ASHURST. I shall observe the proprieties of debate.

Mr. KING. I shall proceed to the consideration of the matter which I was about to discuss.

Mr. ASHURST. And which is not before the Senate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona, permit me to say, often bursts into the Senate like a fiery and untamed—I shall not say steed—but like a magnificent asteroid from the sky; and may I venture to suggest in all kindness he is not always consistent in addressing himself to the subject under consideration.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota, as I understood him, desires discussion of the pending bill and the tariff question. That has been discussed, and will receive further attention. The general questions of commerce and tariff are related to the matter which I purpose discussing.

Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from North Dakota compels a digression for a moment from the matter which I have just announced I would present. The Senator desires the so-called emergency tariff bill discussed. It is not my intention to consider the various items and features of that measure in the discussion of Russian trade and other questions cognate to it. I had intended at a later date in the debate, and after the members of the Committee on Finance had discussed the pending tariff bill and given the Senate the benefit of their investigations and conclusions, to briefly consider some features of the bill. There are some provisions in the bill that differentiate it from a general tariff measure and are justified by antecedent and present conditions. However, the discussion of the measure involving tariff duties can not be fully considered without reference to world economics and trade conditions.

Any discussion of the tariff must necessarily take into consideration the effect of a change in duties upon our exports and our commercial relations with other nations. It would be a revelation of profound unsophistication to enact a tariff bill without taking into account the effect its operation will have upon our foreign commerce. There are some persons who affect to believe that the passage of a tariff measure is a simple process and does not call for an investigation of national and international relations.

There are others who refuse to perceive that the currents which bear this Nation carry all other nations, and that whatever affects this Nation affects others, and these industrial and economic evils from which they suffer find a reaction in our economic life.

Mr. President, I do not desire to be critical, but I express the thought that the position of some Senators can not be defended as consistent or logical. They have eloquently pleaded for a merchant marine and for the development of our foreign trade. Arguments have been made to demonstrate that new trade routes should be opened up, that facilities for foreign exchange should be devised, that impediments calculated to arrest our trade with other nations should be removed, and that we should signalize our financial primacy in the world by becoming the greatest Nation industrially and the greatest export Nation of the world. And yet Senators who have so argued have given support to policies which would prevent the realization of their expressed desires and condemn the American people to commercial isolation and economic chaos.

The illogical position is taken by many of our Republican friends in their discussion of tariff and foreign trade that we can sell to all the world without buying in return. There are still others who urge that our home market is adequate, or, if not adequate, it can be developed so that we can consume all that we produce, and therefore we need no trade relations with the rest of the world. Of course, this view is so provincial, so archaic, as to be unworthy of serious attention. It would carry humanity back to tribal days and disregard the progress which has advanced the world to its present high state of civilization. There are a few professed economists whose views are reflected in the attitude of those who contend that trade may be unilateral and one sided, that we should be exporters only, and that high-tariff walls should be erected to prohibit imports. It might be a most admirable arrangement if we could induce the world to buy all our surplus products, paying therefor high prices, payments to be made in gold and with a few limited commodities which it is impossible to produce in the United States. In this connection it is well to remember that our exports have grown until they now exceed in value more than \$8,000,000,000 per annum. It would require all the gold in the world to pay the American people for their exports during the last calendar year. It is obvious that exports can not be paid for in gold. Payments must be made, by those who purchase from us, in commodities and products of which they have a surplus. Trade and commerce do not rest alone upon gold, but upon the production of the people. The American people must learn that they

can not be a selling nation alone. If they would sell, they must buy; if they would export, they must import; and the lesson must be learned that in erecting barriers against trade the stream may be diverted from our shores and golden argosies pass on to other lands.

Whenever any tariff measure is considered, the broad field of international commerce must be surveyed. Often reasons are urged which not only superficially, but fundamentally, seem to justify the enactment of a measure prohibiting foreign importations of a given commodity, and yet if such reasons prevail and favorable action is taken, experience often proves that reactions with respect to other commodities and products occur, the net result of which is concededly detrimental to the mass of the people.

Nor must it be forgotten that retaliation and reprisals often follow measures aimed against importations. Not only the World War but conditions following the war ought to furnish impressive lessons to the American people that this is a small world and that all nations and all peoples are linked and bound together for weal or woe. The prosperity of one nation brings sunlight into the sky of all other nations.

Our Nation wants the rehabilitation of Europe. European depression and bankruptcy cast darkened clouds over our horizon. The American agriculturist had the lesson vividly portrayed during the last few months that Europe's financial decrepitude reduced to ruinous price levels the agricultural products of the United States. The surplus products from field and farm could find no outlet, though millions were starving in Europe and clamoring for such products. Accordingly a formidable movement was inaugurated for the revival of the War Finance Corporation. It is true that this corporation was a war product and that it was never intended that it should function after the war.

I want to remind Republican Senators that since the armistice the administration has been condemned by Republicans because of its alleged failure to repeal war-time legislation and discontinue activities which were called for by the war. During the recent campaign the administration was denounced by the Republican Party for its alleged interference in the private business affairs of the people and in the assertion of authority which ought to have been surrendered by the Government when the armistice was signed. The War Finance Corporation operated but a short time, and, having served its purpose, became inert. It has now been revived, and the theory of those who secured its resuscitation was that unless something were done to aid the agriculturists in finding foreign markets for their surplus products ruin and disaster would overtake them.

I repeat, an instructive and impressive lesson is brought home to the American farmers, as well as the American people, that our industrial progress and our prosperity depend in a very large degree upon world conditions. Europe to-day needs our surplus products. If she had gold, she would purchase them. She has neither gold nor credit. She is scarcely in a position which would allow capital investments to be made by Americans, and the result is that she must suffer because of her inability to purchase our products, and the American people must suffer because they have surplus products and can find no foreign markets. American business men have loaned to Europe from six to eight billions of dollars. Perhaps the most of this has been utilized to pay for the flour and meat and other commodities which have been carried in our ships to European ports. In other words, in order to make markets for American products, the American business men have been compelled to extend credits to Europe and run the risk and danger of a total or partial loss of the prodigious sums advanced.

There are, as I am advised, manufacturing institutions in the United States, as well as exporting corporations, that are greatly concerned because of the tremendous sums which they have advanced to European peoples, and because it is apparent that it will be a long time before repayment can be made. These vast loans are really capital investments in Europe. They are a withdrawal from the United States of capital which is needed here for investment, and yet the work of those who have extended this credit to Europe is of immense advantage not only to the vendors of products exported to Europe but to the entire business interests of the United States. If there had been no outlet for these products, represented by the six or eight billions loaned to Europe, the financial situation in the United States would have been more serious than it is represented to have been, and the agricultural and manufacturing interests would have encountered more serious difficulties than any to which they have been exposed.

Europe owes the United States Government approximately \$10,000,000,000, and in the face of this tremendous indebtedness the business interests of the United States were constrained to

extend further credit to Europe, aggregating the amount which I have mentioned, in order that a portion of our surplus products might find a foreign market.

I suggest that the attitude of some of those who demand a special session of Congress to enact a tariff bill that will raise tariff schedules to unprecedented heights can not be reconciled with their feverish anxiety to secure foreign markets for the billions of raw materials and finished products which the American people have to export.

Mr. President, the subject which deals with trade and commerce, while it possesses problems and features not free from controversy, is not a dark and mysterious one. It does not involve an excursion into the realm of occultism or metaphysics. Ricardo and Saye, Bastian and Adam Smith, John Stuart Mills and Herbert Spencer, Henry George and Marshall, as well as other great writers upon political economy and related subjects, have elucidated the questions involved in the commercial relations between nations and pointed out with more or less of precision the path of progress and prosperity. A consideration of the great movements which have made for intellectual and moral progress and political and industrial freedom must lead to the inevitable conclusion that the world's advancement has resulted from a closer union between nations and the development of the thought that the interests of all are closely allied.

As I have indicated, national prosperity depends upon the extent of foreign commerce. It is a fallacy to suppose, as some capitalistic societies do, that a nation is to be regarded as a producing organization alone. That is only one factor in the equation. An industrial society does not indefinitely produce without consumption. The manufacturers of our finished products must draw heavily upon raw materials and the producers of the raw materials become consumers of the finished products. Incidentally, the lesson is taught that production and consumption go hand in hand. The wealth of our Nation depends upon its productivity, and its productivity is based upon the consumption of the commodities produced. If consumption is diminished, production is diminished. If no markets are found for commodities produced, there is a diminution in production, a dislocation of labor, and reduction either in hours of labor or in payment for labor, or both, thus producing economic disaster. So in considering the elements making for industrial prosperity the consuming elements of society—and by that I mean not only the society within a nation but a cosmopolitan society—must be taken into account; and yet when tariff legislation is projected the consuming element of society is too frequently wholly ignored. Indeed, the philosophy of Republican protection disregards that question entirely in framing tariff laws. America seems to be regarded by the disciples of high protection as a producing nation only. But discovering that other nations likewise produce and that a portion of their products are brought to our shores, the faulty philosophy of the high protectionist is thereupon invoked, and enactments are sought to prevent importations. The dominant idea seems to be to devise weapons which are supposed to be beneficial to producing organizations. This philosophy does not prompt the wider vision which seeks to discover what will be for the best interest of all the people. And yet we are now confronted with a most extraordinary situation. The production of raw materials is halted because the domestic market is insufficient to absorb a capacity production of the same. Many of our manufacturing plants have closed and others are materially restricting their output, a policy which reacts unfavorably upon labor.

Thousands of persons are thrown out of employment and business paralysis is threatened. But the peoples of Europe are eager to purchase our raw materials and many of our finished products. In order that they may rise from their prostrate and exhausted position, they must have the commodities and products of which we have a surplus. They also need capital and could absorb billions of dollars in capital investments, in the construction of railroads and mills and plants, and in the development of latent and destroyed industries. But they have no gold with which to purchase our products. They can part with no portable capital in payment for that which they buy. They could produce commodities along certain lines in excess of their own needs and which the American people require. A policy which would permit trade between Europe and America would be profitable to us and vital to the salvation of Europe. We should remember the words of Roscher, "Since one nation can lastingly pay another nation only with its own products, any limitation of imports must, under otherwise equal circumstances, be attended by a corresponding limitation of exports." And Prof. Ashley, in discussing the tariff problem, declares that "the notion that foreign nations can sell everything to us and take nothing in exchange except money is, of course, one of the fallacies of popular protectionism. In the long run, unless the

prosperity of a nation is very rapidly declining, indeed, and when such a time comes there is not likely to be any doubt about it, goods are paid for by goods or services." The World War has disturbed the economic currents of the world. Serious deflections may occur in those currents, and wise statesmanship is required to prevent the adoption of uneconomic policies which will react disastrously upon our country.

It must not be forgotten that the United States declined to enter the League of Nations. That action may be regarded as a challenge by other nations within the league to the commercial and other policies which inevitably will result from a concert or union of most of the nations of the world. All things else being equal, members of the league will be given preference in commercial transactions and in trade relations over those beyond its pale. To protect the league and execute its purposes, policies will necessarily be adopted, conceived by those within the league to be necessary for its proper development and perpetuity.

It is true this Nation has given evidence of its devotion to the principles of liberty and the cause of civilization. It poured its treasure into the World War, which threatened the destruction of the allied nations, and has exhibited in many ways its deep sympathy because of the sorrows and wounds of the world, and its profound interest in the serious problems which demand solution at the hands of civilization. Notwithstanding these facts it is manifest that unless this Nation pursues a wise foreign policy, suspicions, indeed, prejudices and deep distrust, will arise, which will produce unfortunate conditions, possibly menacing the peace of the world and threatening our industrial prosperity. We are a part of the world and must play a man's part in solving the problems of the world. Our devotion to our country and its institutions is strongly developed; and let me add, properly developed conceptions of nationality will not be extirpated or destroyed in the assumption of a commanding place in the forward march of the peoples of the world. In political thought this Nation should lead the way. In those fine qualities which are the inheritance of the past and the fruition of the forces of righteousness this Nation is equipped for moral leadership in the world's affairs. In its material resources its primacy can not be questioned. These things may be said not boastfully, but in the interest of precision; and the recitation of the well-known facts respecting this Nation and its strength and force and power and its capacity for world service should awaken within the hearts of all patriotic Americans a desire that America should discharge its full duty to humanity, and pursue that course of honor, of unselfish devotion, and of righteousness, which will extend the sphere of its influence and power and bring to it imperishable glory.

Our policies, whether political or economic, necessarily must take cognizance of a bleeding and suffering world; but even if our course is to be determined by national selfishness, it would be a fatuous policy to erect barriers around this Republic and seek isolation from the world. No nation shines by its own light, nor can any nation live for itself alone. Our prosperity, as I have indicated, depends upon our foreign commerce. A policy must be adopted that will carry our ships to every land and our flag to every port.

The trading nations have always been the advancing, progressive, prosperous nations. China built physical walls and legislative walls—the former to prevent aggressions from enemies to the north, the latter to isolate her from the world. She prevented the streams of progress from flowing to her land, fructifying the soil, liberalizing the thought of the people, and leading them from the barren fields in which they had wandered for centuries.

Trade not only enriches and produces wealth, but it has a broader significance. It liberalizes thought, modifies unfounded and unreasoning racial antipathies, advances science, develops art, promotes education, and knits the peoples of the world into closer union. The powerful forces operating in the world for civilization and world unity, the spiritual and moral forces which, after all, are the enduring and transforming ones, are aided in their beneficent ministrations by those material considerations involved in the international exchange of commodities, products of brain and hand. Chiseled into the granite stones of the magnificent Union Station built in the Capital of the Nation are words which read something like this: He that would bring back the wealth of the Indies must carry the wealth of the Indies with him. If a man would bring back knowledge, he must carry knowledge with him.

And so, Mr. President, if we would send our products—the wealth of our mines and fields and mills—to other lands, we must bring back therefrom the wealth of those lands. There is a striking analogy between the laws governing the diffusion of knowledge and those controlling the operations of trade and commerce. We not only desire to trade with the world, but we desire the best

thought and knowledge of the world. The literature and philosophy and the common law developed in England, we seek to assimilate. The remarkable scientific achievements of the Germans are appreciated and accepted by us. The philosophy of Kant, and the poetry of Goethe, and the music of Beethoven and Wagner add to our intellectual stores and enable us to find a common ground of sympathy and union. And so the contributions made by the nations of the world to the cause of freedom and knowledge and righteousness and everything of an educational value become, through trade, through intercourse, the common property of all, and add to the wealth, material and moral, of all peoples of the world.

Artificial barriers are not reared against knowledge and the ethical forces which guide humanity. It were well if, in our political and governmental policies, we were ever to keep in mind the thought that nations are enriched by the dissemination of knowledge and truth, of music, art, literature, and science, and that material wealth does not consist of gold, or, at least, it is of but little value, measured by the wealth of the world, which is the exchangeable value of the annual products of land and labor. Our national wealth, then, depends upon our production, and production will be determined by the opportunities for the exchange of the produced commodities for commodities produced by others.

Adam Smith states that—

Money, no doubt, always makes part of the national capital, but it has already been shown that it generally makes but a small part, and always the most unprofitable part of it.

There is wisdom in the statement of Adam Smith:

Man is generally considered by statesmen and projectors as the materials of a sort of political mechanics. Projectors disturb nature in the course of her operations on human affairs, and it requires no more than to leave her alone and give her fair play in the pursuit of her ends that she may establish her own designs. * * * Little else is required to carry a state to the highest degree of affluence from the lowest barbarism but peace, easy taxes, and a tolerable administration of justice; all the rest being brought about by the natural course of things.

It would be well if this thought were more controlling in the political and administrative affairs of nations.

We have most of the world's supply of gold, and yet that is not the basis of our wealth. A few years ago the annual value of all products of the United States was, approximately, \$30,000,000,000. Most of this vast sum was consumed by the American people in its production, and a portion consisted of exports. It is this annual production which determines our wealth, and the value of production, measured quantitatively as well as qualitatively, is largely determined by the consumption of such products. If markets are not available for consumption and prices of production fall to ruinous levels, production declines with all its attendant evils. If we would increase production, which is the basis of wealth, we must expand the consuming markets. It is manifest that the resources of this great Nation, together with the energy and genius of the American people, will result in the production of raw materials and finished products greatly in excess of domestic needs. Foreign markets are imperatively needed. Foreign consumers for our surplus products must be found or our industries will be injuriously affected and our material prosperity arrested.

It is evident that the mere possession of gold does not bring prosperity. The economic idea which in the past played so important a part in the consideration of political questions, that wealth and monetary metals are interchangeable terms, is obsolete. The wealth of our Nation is estimated at \$300,000,000,000. The entire amount of gold in the world is approximately \$9,000,000,000.

The mercantile system was founded upon the conception that wealth and monetary metals were related, and, indeed, were identical things. Prof. MacLeod, in his "Principles of Economic Philosophy," states that this idea was the parent of the mercantile system:

Midas saw that with treasure in his hand he was wealthy—he could obtain whatever he wanted, and could command the services of others. * * * The very same ideas gradually grew up in Europe. Sovereigns saw that their chief power consisted in the treasure they could accumulate. It then became a cardinal point in their policy to encourage the importation of money as much as possible and to prohibit its export. * * * The Spaniards, dazzled with the brilliant prospect of securing the greatest part of the wealth of the world without labor, imagined that the well-being of the country consisted in amassing enormous heaps of gold and silver.

The soundness of this view was questioned as population increased and intercourse between nations became more general. It may be stated that the value of gold is determined by the existence of consumable wealth, which requires distribution through exchange, and where gold is used to facilitate exchange it has value. I am not referring to its value in the arts, but for monetary purposes. It would seem that the quantity of production at any given period, whether of raw materials or manu-

factured products, bears but slight relation to the quantity of metallic money, but is rather dependent upon the demands for consumption purposes of such products and the facility with which the interchange of commodities may be effectuated.

Mr. Webster, in his speech upon the tariff in the House of Representatives in 1824, states that:

Commerce is not a gambling among nations for a state to be won by some and lost by others. It has not the tendency to impoverish one of the parties of it while it enriches the other. All parties gain, all parties make profits, all parties grow rich by the operations of just and liberal commerce. * * * We have reciprocal wants and reciprocal means for gratifying one another's wants. This is the true origin of commerce, which is nothing more than the exchange of equivalents, and from the rude barter of its primitive state to the refined and complex conditions in which we see it its principle is uniformly the same, its object being in every stage to produce that exchange of commodities between individuals and between nations which shall conduce to the advantage and to the happiness of both. Commerce between nations has the same essential character as commerce between individuals or between parts of the same nation. Can not two individuals make an interchange of commodities which shall prove beneficial to both or in which the balance of trade shall be in favor of both? If not, the tailor and the shoemaker, the farmer and the smith, have hitherto very much misunderstood their own interest. And with regard to the internal trade of a country, in which the same rule would apply as between nations, do we ever speak of such an intercourse being prejudicial to one side because it is useful to the other? De we ever hear that because the intercourse between New York and Albany is advantageous to one of these places it must therefore be ruinous to the other?

These generalizations in which I have been indulging may not be pertinent to the bill under discussion. Whether that be true or not, they will be germane to the discussion of the tariff situation, which, it is announced, will be presented when, soon after the 4th of March, Congress will be convened for the purpose of enacting what has been denominated "a comprehensive tariff bill." I have no doubt that economic principles demonstrated to be sound and irrefragable will be disregarded by the majority, and the measure enacted will be reactionary and wholly at variance with the progressive and liberalizing influence which should guide the world.

I was speaking a moment ago of the illogical and inconsistent attitude of our Republican friends. They encourage the farmer and the manufacturer to demand of Congress the revival of the War Finance Corporation. The farmer is told that Europe needs his wheat and corn, as well as other products for which there is no domestic market. The manufacturers are told that Europe needs locomotives and cars and agricultural implements and manufactured products, and that if Europe could purchase our surplus products prices would advance, factories would resume, and the sun of prosperity shine upon all the land. But when the farmers and the manufacturers seek for a market the same Republican political teachers advise them that the imports from Europe are wholly inadequate to purchase surplus American products required by European nations, and that credits must be extended to Europe, though the solvency of Europe is in doubt, and those credits will have to be guaranteed by American business men and bankers or by the Government itself. But it was deemed so imperative that European markets be obtained that Congress responded to the demands of the people and revived the War Finance Corporation, which is authorized to issue bonds to the extent of five or six billions of dollars.

Under this policy we are to loan Europe billions of dollars more because of her inability to make payment for American commodities. And having taken that step the next course to be pursued is to prohibit Europe from exporting to the United States the pitifully small quantities of commodities which she can spare to aid in liquidating her indebtedness for commodities which Americans have sold to her at a profit. Of course, this policy means either the extension of more credit or the diminution of our exports. Doubtless Europe would be willing to keep on buying American products if America would continue to extend credits. It must be remembered, however, that the Government of the United States has loaned to the allied nations nearly \$10,000,000,000 and that American business men have extended credits to European nations to the amount of between six and eight billions of dollars. It would be interesting to hear the plan proposed by these high protectionists, in which Europe is to repay the sixteen billions owing the United States and the American people. It would be sheer stupidity not to perceive that only by commodity exports and capital investments can this stupendous sum be paid. It is obvious that we can not continue indefinitely to extend credits to Europe. If we continue to sell to Europe, then we must be ready to receive in payment for our commodities European commodities. Senators have exhibited considerable concern regarding our European loans and the failure of European nations to meet the interest charges thereon. I repeat, the period has arrived when it might be regarded as unwise for business men to make further loans to Europe. At any rate, it would, in my judgment, be highly im-

proper for the Government to make further advances. I desire to qualify that statement, however, to this extent: A situation might develop in Europe which would call for financial aid to maintain nations which we helped to erect and which in all honor we are bound to aid in maintaining.

The "comprehensive" tariff bill which we are promised as an act of supreme statesmanship upon the part of the Republican Party will be aimed, I have no doubt, against imports. It will be based upon the proposition that we can sell to an impoverished world which is unable to pay in money and which can only pay through exchange of commodities. How payment is to be made by those to whom we sell is a problem which the statesmanship of the Republican Party is incapable of solving. The theory of our Republican friends might be stated in the form of a resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the prosperity of the American people depends upon production.

Resolved, That foreign markets must be obtained for American products.

Resolved further, That we will sell our surplus products to the peoples of the world.

Resolved further and finally, That no foreign products will be received in exchange for or payment of such products and commodities exported from the United States.

Mr. President, our country is blessed indeed to have political philosophers and exponents of economic thoughts to work out in such a profoundly scientific and felicitous way the problem of our foreign commerce.

When the extraordinary session of Congress convenes in April, we may be assured, Mr. President, that our Republican friends will remove from the mausoleums in which they have been entombed the remains of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, the Dingley bill, and the McKinley bill, and supreme efforts will be made to quicken and galvanize those shriveled, misshapen, and hideous forms, in order that they may be the models to be followed in building the "comprehensive, scientific," and truly-Republican tariff which has been promised as a panacea for all the ills that afflict this distracted and disordered world. Mr. President, our Republican friends already give evidence of their retrogressive propensities; backward their gaze is turned. They grope in the shadows of the past and in the graveyards in which are interred issues and policies and passions and prejudices, heresies and fallacies, condemned and destroyed by the militant, vibrant, and inspired forces which have carried forward and will continue to advance our Nation as well as all peoples of the world. Mr. President, the American people will not return to shadow lands. They are watching the eastern star and see the approach of the morning light, and the radiance that will bring prosperity and happiness to the American people, and peace and progress and freedom to the sorrowing nations of the world.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. The Senator speaks of the promise of a carefully considered and well-digested bill in the future, in which I presume we will have the benefit of the findings and elaborate studies of the Tariff Commission and a thorough knowledge of the schedules considered. This bill, as I understand it, without regard to textiles puts a duty on wool. I am under the impression that hitherto we have been told that the duty upon raw wool, the duty upon tops, the duty upon yarns, and the duty upon textile fabrics were all indissolubly interwoven, and that it would be impossible to put an adequate or a defensible duty upon one item in the wool plan and schedule without materially affecting every other item; that from the back of the sheep to the back of the man the industry was so interwoven that a tariff had to be adjusted to the whole, and that you could not, while you wait, put a duty upon any one of these articles in justice to the public and in justice to the beneficiaries of the duty without adjusting it to the other articles. Does that rule still prevail?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator, if I understand him, has accurately stated the contention of our friends upon the other side of the aisle. There is one suggestion made by the Senator which leads me for a moment from the line of thought which I was pursuing. He referred to the Tariff Commission. Evidences daily accumulate, indicating that the Republican Party has determined upon the death of the Tariff Commission. I hold no brief for that organization and shall not enter upon a discussion of its merits or demerits. However, for many years there was a demand from students of economic questions, and from broad and liberal statesmen, that an impartial tribunal should be created for the purpose of collecting information and statistics and making recommendations to Congress concerning revenue measures, particularly those dealing with

imports. It was known that too often tariff schedules were written by special interests, by those who sought to obtain benefits and advantages at the expense of the people. Tariff schedules, it was known, were often written or dictated by trusts or great industrial organizations which had become powerful through exploitation permitted behind the ramparts of high tariff measures. Mr. Roosevelt became convinced of the necessity for a Tariff Commission, and he earnestly sought to have one created.

I am advised—and if my advices are incorrect, I hope the chairman of the Committee on Finance will correct me—that in the preparation of the so-called "emergency tariff measure" now before us, the Tariff Commission was given but little if any consideration. Indeed, I doubt if any members of the commission were called, or the data or information collated by them resorted to. I have no doubt that when the extraordinary session of Congress is called, and the committees are considering the beneficent, "scientific and comprehensive" tariff bill promised us, the Tariff Commission will not be consulted, its recommendations will not be accepted, and its data and information will be entirely ignored. That bill, Mr. President, will be dictated by the same influences that secured the passage of the McKinley bill and the Dingley bill and the Payne-Aldrich bill. It will be a measure in the interest of the favored few, of special classes of industries and corporations which have grown rich and powerful through exactions levied upon the American people under the schedules of Republican tariff measures.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. I have been very much interested in the very able argument the Senator is making upon a most vital subject, but it strikes me that there is no room left for speculation as to the attitude of the majority party toward the tariff measure, if they are consistent. They are not always consistent. The bill is not an emergency tariff bill, if a tariff is any kin or is related even remotely to the process of collecting duties at ports of entry for the purpose of maintaining the expenses of a government economically administered. The old idea was once argued that that was the main purpose of a tariff and that we had incidental benefits.

This is a bold, almost a brazen, announcement of the fact that in a time of peace, without injury to business, we can lay an embargo upon the most prominent of the essentials of the life of the people. A duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on wheat at \$1.50 a bushel is not intended to collect money at any Canadian or any other port. It is intended to prevent the importation of that commodity as long as the law is in effect, and it is admitted that that is the purpose. A duty of 25 cents a bushel, of 60 pounds, on potatoes is not intended to collect revenue and would not collect revenue, because the difference in the price of potatoes in one market and another is such that that would be an embargo. A duty of 40 cents a bushel on onions is an embargo. A duty of 1½ cents per pound upon lemons is an embargo. A duty of 30 per cent ad valorem upon cattle is an embargo, because the difference between the cost of that commodity in the markets of the world and the cost of the commodity in the markets here is such that no importer could pay the difference. So on down the list.

Now, if we can levy not a duty which is intended to adjust itself to world-wide commercial conditions and conditions of international trade, but if we can lay an embargo on these things to the benefit of the whole country, the most vital things to the lives and comforts of the people affecting their raiment, affecting their food, we can certainly levy upon textiles and dyes and paints and perfumes. Why hesitate? If we can handle these things in that way and are handling them sincerely, why not take 15 minutes more and go down the whole schedule and raise the wall to the stars and save such money as we now have to expend for the Tariff Commission? If Senators are consistent, it strikes me there is no reason to defend or to expect the continuance of the Tariff Commission for another day.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has supported the view which I expressed that the Tariff Commission has been condemned to an early dissolution. I have no doubt but that our Republican friends have already prepared its grave—the final ceremonies have been prepared to enwrap the cold and silent figure when the debt thrust which takes its life has been administered by the Republican Party; and soon after the 4th of March the solemn procession will be formed, headed by the gallant leaders of the high protective forces, and it will pass out from this Chamber, and the remains of this short-lived and somewhat immature commission will joyfully and gleefully be laid away by our Republican friends in what they hope will be its final resting place.

Mr. President, I suggested a moment ago that Mr. Roosevelt earnestly supported the creation of a tariff commission. It is somewhat astonishing to behold the mutability of the opinions

of our Republican friends in regard to those who at times defied their authority and denounced their policies.

It is only a few years ago when the name of Theodore Roosevelt was anathema to many of the Republican Party. He led a revolt against the reactionary and retrogressive policies of his own party and challenged the powerful forces that controlled it. He believed that the Republican Party was in the grip of sinister influences, that its policies were inimical to the best interests of the American people, and that its leaders were dominated by forces which sought special privileges at the expense of the people. I shall not dwell upon the serious charges which he preferred against his own party and its leaders. When defeated at the Republican convention by methods which I shall not attempt to characterize, but with which the American people are quite familiar, he organized the Progressive Party. He wrote a platform that inspired millions of Americans, and with courage and commanding ability he led his followers through a bitter and unsuccessful campaign. He was denounced by the Republican leaders and by the powerful elements in the Republican Party. Though I did not agree with Mr. Roosevelt and gave my support then, as I always have done, to the Democratic Party, I think it may be said that he sought the welfare of the American people and believed that the Republican Party had been betrayed and was guided by the philosophy of opportunism and directed by predatory interests.

During the campaign which was waged the leaders of the Republican Party and those who supported Mr. Taft denounced Mr. Roosevelt and the Progressive Party. Perhaps no more bitter attacks were ever made upon a candidate for the Presidency than those to which Mr. Roosevelt was subjected by members of the Republican Party. Some of his most savage assailants now carry the flag of the Republican Party and their influence controls its policies. Now that Theodore Roosevelt has passed to the Great Beyond, the Republican Party, particularly those who were most conspicuous in their opposition to him and in their condemnation of his policies, are chanting his praises and attempting to convince the American people that they are the residuary legatees of his political estate, the heirs of his political principles and policies, and that into their hands has been committed the banner of the Progressive Party.

Is not the claim made that they have abandoned the archaic, oppressive, and reactionary policies which Mr. Roosevelt condemned, and which they defended under the leadership of Mr. Taft? Or possibly the contention may be made that Mr. Roosevelt and the Progressives abandoned the principles for which he and they stood and penitently sought readmission into the Republican Party and made due expiation for their transgressions. Senators will recall that in this Chamber some Republican Senators have invoked the spirit of Roosevelt and deplored that his silent lips could not speak for the guidance of the American people. Mr. President, why do not our Republican friends follow some of the policies so vigorously advocated by Mr. Roosevelt? He was deeply interested in the Tariff Commission. He attacked the old methods of writing tariff laws, and pleaded for a tariff commission that would aid in preparing a scientific and proper revenue law—one which would yield revenue, so greatly required to meet the expenses of the Government; one which was not in the interest of a few protected industries, and which could be used as a weapon with which to oppress the masses.

But, as stated, the Tariff Commission is doomed. Our Republican friends have condemned it without trial—without witnesses. It has been denied due process of law and has been sentenced to be executed, and unless some unforeseen power arises to protect it the sentence of execution will be carried into effect.

Mr. President, I was diverted by the statement of the Senator from Kentucky into a brief reference to the Tariff Commission and Mr. Roosevelt.

Our Republican friends, as I have stated, were so anxious to secure a European market for our agricultural products, in order that anticipated catastrophic conditions here might be avoided, that they were willing, notwithstanding Europe's stupendous indebtedness to the United States of between sixteen and eighteen billions of dollars, to arrange for the extension of additional credits, though such a course would involve the Government of the United States morally, if not legally. I believe, Mr. President, that the ability of the War Finance Corporation to dispose of its securities in order to extend credits to Europe will depend upon the Government itself; in other words, the plan to loan billions to Europe will fail unless the Government assumes a direct or indirect obligation with respect to the securities issued. Why are our Republican friends so eager to revive the War Finance Corporation?

The answer is plain. They know that the American farmer and cotton grower and woolgrower and cattleman and the manu-

facturers of finished products must have foreign markets, and that the financial depression which has overtaken us is in part due to the inability of European nations to purchase American commodities.

Mr. President, our Republican friends have indulged in much rhapsody about the merchant marine and the American flag floating in every port. I am led to remark that American ships were upon every sea and the American flag was found in every port prior to the destruction of the American merchant marine by the unwise policies of the Republican Party following the Civil War. Whatever merchant marine we now have has been developed under a Democratic administration. The policy of the Democratic Party, from the days of Jefferson until the time of Lincoln, resulted in the building of American ships and the development of a merchant marine, so that 87 per cent of our foreign commerce was carried by American vessels and under the American flag. When the Democratic Party came into power in 1912 we had no merchant marine. President Wilson and the Democratic Party earnestly endeavored to supply the imperative needs of the American people, and we now have hundreds of ships employed and ready to carry our ocean commerce. Our Republican friends are now eloquent in proclaiming the necessity of a merchant marine. They appreciate how important it is for the expansion of our foreign commerce that Americans shall own and control an adequate merchant marine.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Utah will observe the lack of interest on the other side of the Chamber. There are eight times as many Senators on the Democratic side of the Chamber who are present and in their seats as there are Senators on the Republican side of the Chamber.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Mississippi will not ask for a quorum. When the able Senator from North Dakota made his opening argument in favor of the pending measure, but few Senators upon his own side of the Chamber gave attention, and when the Senator from North Carolina, the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Finance, submitted his argument against the bill there were but few Senators in the Chamber. We can not heal some people who are sick. Diseases become so chronic that medicaments or physicians effect no cures. Many of our Republican friends, like Ephraim of old, are joined to their idols. The Republican Party, controlled by protectionist forces, ignore economic laws and close their eyes to the public welfare. Their blind devotion to the protection fetish hurled them from power eight years ago, and now so intoxicated with victory are many of those whose voices are powerful in the organization that they have determined, in the next session of Congress, to erect tariff barriers so high that the domestic market will become a monopoly in the hands of special interests and the favored few. The Republican Party was not courageous enough to make the tariff an issue in the recent campaign, nor were the issues which they presented uniform in all parts of the land. Perhaps I should apologize for stating that the Republican Party presented issues. In one respect only were they consistent, and that was in abuse and violent criticism of President Wilson. I doubt if any President has been so wantonly and unjustly assailed as he. It is true President Washington was the subject of most bitter attacks and his political opponents ascribed to him designs and purposes which, if he had entertained them, would have warranted his impeachment. President Lincoln was likewise the subject of vituperation, slander, and abuse. Mr. Wilson was charged with having exercised dictatorial power and joined with other nations in the creation of a supernational. The campaign waged by the opposition to the Democratic Party was a most subtle and intriguing one. Attempts were made to fan the flames of discontent, even though the flames might spread until they assumed menacing proportions to the public safety.

The Democrats were denounced for failing to repeal war legislation, but the people were not told by the Republicans that President Wilson had months before the campaign recommended the repeal of such legislation and that his recommendations were ignored by a Republican Congress. The failure to deal with post-war problems was ascribed to the administration, although the Republicans had control of both the House and the Senate and were responsible for such failure. The plain fact is that the Republican Party seemed incapable of meeting the problems which followed the war or of giving legislative approval to measures dealing with our domestic questions or relating to our foreign affairs.

The Democrats were blamed for Republican defaults, and the people did not realize that the failure to deal with questions of readjustment and post-war problems was due to the Republicans and not to the Democratic administration. President Wilson made earnest recommendations to the Republican Congress and called attention to needed legislation, but his suggestions were ignored and the remedies recommended denied. The Democrats were denounced because of high prices, and yet the Republicans having control of both branches of Congress refused to pass legislation to correct conditions. The Attorney General was denounced by some for enforcing the Lever Act against profiteers, and at the same time the Republicans were condemning the President for continuing in peace times war legislation.

Moreover, appeals were made to the prejudices of American citizens of foreign birth. The most subtle and sinister efforts were made to deliver to the Republican Party all foreign-born American citizens. Conditions in Europe were seized upon for the purpose of inflaming the minds of the millions of foreign-born American citizens in order that they might, in group formation, support the Republican Party. The appeals made to race prejudices would lead one to believe that encouragement was given to the thought that these various groups owed to governments beyond the sea an allegiance which would prevent them from bearing true faith and allegiance to this Republic. These appeals and efforts related to all foreign groups. Attempts were made to deliver the Germans as a block, and the Italians and the Slavs and the Irish. The most sordid appeals were made to the American people, and an unfair and disingenuous campaign conducted. The subtle appeals and the methods pursued misled many and blinded their vision to the real issues and the pathway of national safety as well as national honor.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEFLIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. I hope that my gifted and forceful friend, the Senator from Utah, will not do an injustice to Senators on the other side of the Chamber. Does the Senator from Utah mean to intimate that the wise men of the Republican Party in conducting the campaign were guilty of such a lack of wisdom or cunning that in their efforts to reach the discontented of every race in every city in the East by appeals to prejudice, to everything that partook of envy or hate or discontent or malice toward the President or country or flag, they did not tell those people at that time of their well-concealed design to prevent, as far as they could by hurried, and admittedly hurried legislation, any effort or any condition that would lower the price of bread or meat or raiment?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I pay tribute to the adroitness and skill of the Republican leadership. Whether the honors are to be accorded to Mr. Hays or to others with whom he was associated, it is not for me to say. If there was an—I was about to say "argument," but I withdraw the word—if there was a prejudice that could be appealed to, a racial antipathy that could be developed, a wound that could be reopened, an evil that could be magnified, an insinuation or suggestion that could possibly influence an individual or a section or a class, there were agencies and instrumentalities and forces immediately available to press for advantage. In many parts of the United States a strong sentiment existed in favor of the Versailles treaty and the League of Nations. Our Republican friends, with an audacity that challenges admiration, were there proclaiming with fervid eloquence that they believed in a league of nations, in a concert of the free peoples of the earth, in a union of all nations to promote peace, to secure disarmament, to stabilize Europe, and to promote the progress of the world.

Theodore Roosevelt and the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and other Republicans were quoted as having for years advocated an association of the nations of the world in the interest of world peace; indeed, in the localities to which I have just referred our Republican friends contended that they were the original exponents of a league of nations. And where it was discovered that there was opposition to the covenant of the league, or to any association of nations to secure the avowed purpose of the league, with as much audacity they denounced the League of Nations and any form of association of the nations of the world, or any step by the United States which would bring it into association with other nations.

Mr. President, it might be unparliamentary to say, and therefore I shall not say, that those who conducted the campaign for the Republican Party wore various masks and appeared in

different affairs and sought to be all things to all men. I suggest the possibility of the thought arising in the minds of ordinary individuals that the subtleties and contradictions and posings and inconsistencies of our political opponents afforded no convincing proof of their sincerity or high moral purpose. However, victory hides mistakes and errors; it seems, often, to condone wrongs, transform subtleties into virtues and hypocrisies and insincerities into verities.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I take it that the Senator is now explaining how the Republican leaders secured the Republican vote. Will he also explain how they secured several million Democratic votes?

Mr. KING. The explanation is not difficult, and can be easily made; but it may not satisfy the Senator from Idaho. The same artful propaganda conducted by our Republican friends appealed to some Democrats as it appealed to Republicans and to many of the so-called doubtful voters.

The disordered condition of the world and the distractions following the World War influenced the American voter. Fundamentals were obscured and questions of expediency and opportunism assumed large proportions and seductive appearances. The great principles of Jefferson were forgotten by some Democrats and specious arguments and glittering generalities proved too attractive to some who had pledged devotion to those immortal principles given to the world by the greatest political philosopher of all time. Individuals and parties do not always exhibit supreme loyalty to the truth and to the enduring things which should be the base upon which human conduct rests. I am afraid that Democrats have not always been loyal to the principles of its founders.

Mr. BORAH. And particularly, Mr. President, when they have abandoned the great fundamental principle of Jefferson's policy of no entangling alliances with foreign powers.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not be diverted by my friend into a discussion of what the words "entangling alliances" mean as they were employed by Jefferson. It will be remembered, however, that Mr. Jefferson approved of an understanding or arrangement or alliance, whatever it may be termed, with Great Britain, and announced that the two nations thus united could defy the world. My time is limited or I should be glad to show to the Senator from Idaho that the League of Nations was not an entangling alliance. It rather sought the disentanglement of nations and the development of a concert of the nations of the earth in the interest of peace and world security. Mr. Wilson planned to relieve the world from the evils of secret alliances which were entangling, from the accepted view of the so-called "balance of power," from the burdens of military and naval armament. It was the thought of the proponents of the league that the day had come when international law should receive a new baptism, a new meaning, and become a vital and living force among the nations of the world. The league aimed and sought to bring order to a disordered and sorrowing world and to lay the foundations of international confidence and good will. Washington and Adams and Jefferson spoke against the "political system" which then existed in the world, which was hostile to the principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the aims of this Republic. But that system has been shattered and democratic nations have been erected upon the ruins of empires and autocracies. The moral and ethical forces of the world are united to secure international peace, and they recognize a league of nations as an instrumentality to that end.

Returning to the interrogation of my friend as to the reason why Democrats supported the Republican candidate, permit me to say that there were many voters who desired the ratification of the Versailles treaty and who were in favor not only of a league of nations but the covenant of the league as found in the treaty, with perhaps some reservations. But they believed that the ratification of the treaty was impossible, even if a Democratic President were elected, because the large number of Republican Senators would prevent obtaining the required two-thirds majority. They interpreted Mr. Harding's statements as favorable to a league of nations and believed that if he were elected the primary and vital things in the covenant of the league would be realized. The able Senator from Idaho knows that the statements of Mr. Harding were construed by many as an approval of a union or association between the United States and the great powers of the world for the purpose of realizing the very things which the covenant of the League of Nations sought to accomplish. Mr. Hoover, ex-President Taft, and other Republicans of national standing supported Mr. Harding upon

the theory that under his administration the principal features of the league would be realized. People knew that President Taft and Mr. Hoover, as well as other prominent Republicans, were earnest supporters of the League of Nations. The nationwide campaign conducted by these distinguished men in favor of Mr. Harding profoundly affected the view of the people. President Taft, particularly, had been regarded as one of the chief exponents and defenders of the league. When he proclaimed, as he did during the campaign, that the principles and purposes of the league would be realized under Mr. Harding, the people were impressed with his statements and large numbers were influenced to support the Republican nominee who otherwise would have given their support to Gov. Cox.

Of course, there were many who believed that the Republican platform was deceptive and insincere; that it was adroitly phrased in order to deceive the people and to permit the contention, where such contention would be popular, that Mr. Harding and the Republican Party were opposed not only to the League of Nations but to any league or union between the United States and other nations, and to justify the opposite position where it was indorsed by a particular section, that Mr. Harding and the Republican Party were desirous of entering into an agreement or arrangement with the allied and other nations to secure world peace and to accomplish the very purposes for which the league was organized.

Another factor, which I referred to a moment ago, can not be ignored in appraising the causes leading to the Republican victory. Subtle and sinister appeals were made to those of foreign birth residing in the United States. There are millions of American citizens who were born in lands across the sea. A most sinister and intensive propaganda was carried on among our foreign-born citizens for the purpose of forming them into groups, the lines of which were to be racial, and those groups were then to be carried bodily into the Republican Party. It was charged in those sections where there were German-American citizens that the American people were not behind the war, but that it was the result of Mr. Wilson's hatred of Germany and his love of England. The campaign in this regard was most dastardly. The cause of the war was misrepresented and efforts were made to inflame the minds of American citizens of foreign birth against the administration because of the entrance of the United States into the war. Mr. Wilson and the Democratic Party were charged with being the authors of America's participation in the war. This attempt to impugn the honor of the American people was an insult to them and to our country and a wicked slander of the President and the Democratic Party. In these same sections statements were made by Republicans that if Mr. Harding was elected President, not only would the league be "scrapped," but the Versailles treaty would be destroyed. It was argued to German-Americans that when the treaty was repudiated Germany would be free from its obligations to Europe, and it would rise phoenixlike from the ashes of defeat and the United States and Germany would form an alliance or union which would enable them to control the destinies of the world. It is apparent what effect this sinister and insidious propaganda would have upon many American citizens of foreign birth. I have no criticism of those who were born in Germany who are now American citizens for entertaining a feeling of affection for their fatherland. It is natural—indeed it is proper—that they should have a profound admiration for the development and progress and achievements of the German people.

Permit me to state that Germany is great even in defeat; that the German people possess those traits and qualities that will enable them to rise from the ruins which their imperialism precipitated and become a potent force among the nations of the earth; if they will turn from imperialism and from the militaristic policies developed under the Kaiser, if they will reject the philosophy of Nietzsche and Bernhardt and accept the principles of freedom and genuine democracy they will soon take their place with the enlightened and progressive nations of the world and make contribution to the forces which carry humanity forward.

And pleas were made to Irish-Americans and to citizens who were born in Italy and in Poland and other nations of Europe, all calculated to arouse any racial antipathies that might exist, even though such a course might tend to weaken their allegiance to the Government of the United States and their loyalty to the American flag. The Fiume incident was extravagantly amplified and persistently paraded before the citizens of Italian birth in order to arouse animosities against President Wilson and the Democratic Party. It is not too much to say that many votes were cast for Mr. Harding by American citizens of foreign birth whose inclinations and affections would naturally lead them to support the Democratic Party because

of the misrepresentations and appeals to passion and prejudice which so largely characterized the methods of the Republican campaign.

Mr. President, I have hastily referred to some of the reasons which influenced Democrats to support the Republican Party. Others readily suggest themselves to those who are familiar with the recent campaign. I take this opportunity, however, Mr. President, to warn the Republican Party that its conduct since the election has not strengthened it with the American people. Men and women everywhere in the land are examining its record, its two years of legislative record, and are reaching the conclusion that it has exhibited incompetency in dealing with the problems before the country. The preelection promises and the statements made during the campaign are being examined.

The post-election achievements have been scrutinized and throughout the land there is a feeling that perhaps the people were deceived, that false issues were presented and the truth obscured. It is my sincere belief that if the American people were called upon to express themselves to-day many who gave their support in the recent election to the Republican Party would say that it has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. As the days go by the American people, in my opinion, will awaken to the fact that a grave injustice was done the President of the United States and the Democratic administration and that the triumphant victory of the Republicans was the result, not of a fair and dispassionate consideration of vitally important questions but was due in part to the intrusion into the campaign of extraneous issues and the consideration of policies collateral to the supreme issues which are yet to be determined. The hollowness of Republican promises will be realized by the American people; and one does not need prophetic gifts to determine what the result of the next election will be. The American people desire the enthronement of those policies which will establish freedom and justice and which will bring into proper accord and union the free peoples of the world in the interest of international peace and good will.

There was another factor entering into the late campaign that influenced the result; that was the wicked and wanton assault made upon the President of the United States. He was denounced by his enemies and those who sought the success of the Republican Party, as an autocrat, and credited with a design to usurp authority and exercise power in contravention of the Constitution of the United States.

I have been honored with the friendship of Woodrow Wilson. I have not always agreed with him. Some of his views I believed to be economically unsound, and some policies which he advocated met with my disfavor and I expressed disapproval. But I am sanguine that a dispassionate review of his acts as President and the results and accomplishments of his administration, will for all time place him among the world's foremost figures. Even in the hour of defeat his greatness is recognized, and his influence is pervasive.

He reached the high place which history will accord him, because of his intellectual integrity, his exalted ideals, his devotion to human liberty, and his deep sympathy for the sorrows and sufferings of the world. He saw peoples shackled by industrial chains and nations oppressed by despotic power, and he sought their liberation.

This Nation he regarded as the favored child of Providence, an evangel to lead the way along the pathway of international development. The imperialism of nations, the mad ambitions which prompted rulers to seek territorial gain and conquest, filled him with sorrow, indeed with anger; but it was the great inarticulate mass, struggling and groping for light and freedom, to whom he gave the rich outpourings of his heart. He sought to lighten the burdens of labor, to lift up the downtrodden, and to inspire courage in the hearts of those who saw nothing in life but the cold tragic processes of a materialistic universe. He believed that there were moral and spiritual forces operating within this little world of ours, and that beyond the stars there was One whose power was omnipotent and whose love extended to struggling humanity and whose law operated for man's salvation.

Woodrow Wilson is a commanding figure in the world to-day. He will soon leave his high station, but his teachings and his example will not be forgotten, and as the years go by his fame will increase and men will pay homage to his memory. He gave his strength fighting for principles which he believed to be right, for his country and its honor, for the liberation of the world from war, and for the establishment of a union of the nations of the world to promote justice and international peace.

In my opinion, time will vindicate this great man, and the purposes of his heart will be fully comprehended by his countrymen.

We speak of Jefferson as the father of Democracy, the founder of an undying faith, the prophet of liberty, and the foe of tyranny. We speak of Lincoln as the Great Emancipator, the apostle of justice and righteousness. Those who come after us will speak of Woodrow Wilson as one who sought to extend the principles established by Jefferson and to bring emancipation to oppressed people everywhere. It will be said of him that he gathered into his great soul the highest moral and spiritual and liberalizing forces of his time, and gave his strength, if not his life, in order that there might be a new baptism of freedom and a consecration to the ideals which promote justice and international fellowship. And so there will be linked the names of Jefferson and Lincoln and Wilson, and our children and those who come after us will seek his shrine and there pay homage to a great Democrat and to the strongest defender of the weak and oppressed who appeared among men during the greatest crisis in the world's history.

Mr. President, I did not obtain the floor this morning for the purpose of discussing the tariff or the recent election or the policies of President Wilson. I intended to consider, as I stated at the beginning of my remarks, some of the suggestions made by the Senator from Maryland concerning Russia and the policy which our Nation had pursued and should pursue toward the soviet dictatorship; but I have been prevented by inquiries and suggestions made by my Republican friends and the Senator from Kentucky from carrying out my purpose, and have been lead into remote fields; but before recurring to the subject of Russia permit me to further elaborate the thought which was suggested by the Senator from North Dakota.

I have been unable to quite reconcile the attitude of our Republican friends in advocating a policy which would extend further credits to Europe—upon the theory that our prosperity depends upon our trade relations with European nations—and their avowed purpose to enact at the approaching special session of Congress a tariff bill the effect of which will be, if we are to believe current reports, to deny the right of other nations to find markets in the United States for their products.

I call the attention of the country to the fact that we professed a deep interest in the sufferings of the world and an anxious solicitude for the financial and economical regeneration of the nations still suffering from the effects of war. We declare that we are and will continue to be a creditor nation, and must admit that neither interest nor principal now due the United States can be paid with gold, but only with commodities or by capital investments.

Will the Republican Party when it is in supreme control of the executive and legislative branches of the Government proclaim a policy of commercial isolation? Are the people to be satisfied with the fallacies and heresies which found defenders in the ranks of supporters of high protectionism a few decades ago? Are the American people to be adjured to increase production, not only for domestic use, but for export purposes, only to be misled into an acceptance of the view that surplus products can be sold abroad to our advantage, but that imports in payment are to be prohibited? I fancy there will be some difficulty in explaining how we can be an exporting nation but not an importing nation. The proposition is enticing that we will produce and sell abroad and get rich through that process, but not be required to purchase or receive the productions of other peoples. Our books on political economy should be burned and new professors and new philosophers provided for the guidance of the people.

But the workingman knows that if he receives he must give, and that if he gives he will receive. He has labor to sell and receives in return those commodities essential for the sustenance of himself and his family. Employment is based upon the theory of trade or exchange; labor is exchanged for commodities. So it is between nations; the more we can sell abroad the greater will be our production, and as production increases the demand for labor increases. Earth yields her treasures as the result of increased labor, and those treasures, carried by rail and ship, create new markets for labor as well as for raw and finished products. I am interested to know how European nations are to pay the cotton growers of the South for the millions of bales of cotton which result from their energy and labor. They can not pay in gold nor American securities. Great Britain has furnished us our best market. Her purchases have been greater than those of any other nation, and as a result of the exchange between the two nations our production has increased and our prosperity has been added to.

A few years ago we were a pastoral and an agricultural people. The great majority of Americans resided upon their farms and in rural communities. But a change has occurred. We have been transformed from an agricultural people to an

urban population. While the number of our farmers has increased and agricultural productions have multiplied, our cities have likewise increased in number, and their populations have grown in a most remarkable manner, and so we not only have agricultural products to ship abroad, but our great manufacturing centers are producing far in excess of our domestic needs.

Since the Democrats came into power in 1912 we have built a great merchant marine. The United States owns several thousand vessels aside from those used for naval purposes, and there are thousands of crafts flying the American flag owned by corporations and private individuals. Our foreign commerce during the past eight years has increased far beyond the expectations of the most sanguine, so that during the past year the records show that our exports have been approximately \$8,000,000,000 and our imports nearly \$6,000,000,000. Europe needs more in the future than we have exported in the past. Foreign nations will buy more than eight billions of our products, providing we will accept in payment therefor the only things with which they can pay. Are we to adopt a policy that will compel the withdrawal of our flag from the seas and result in tying our ships to the docks there to rot and decay? These are questions, Mr. President, that are to be answered by the Republican Party in the future.

Of course, it is known that tariff legislation to be enacted at the special session is not designed for revenue purposes. No tariff bill will yield the amount of revenue necessary to meet the annual expenses of the Federal Government. My recollection is that the largest amount of revenue obtained in any one year from customs duties did not greatly exceed \$300,000,000. Under the present tariff law our customs receipts are approximately \$280,000,000 per year. If the policy of the Republican Party is to be such as announced, the measures which they enact will restrict importations and reduce the amount of revenue derived therefrom.

No, Mr. President, the "scientific" bill which we are to have will not be designed for revenue purposes. Other means must be devised for the purpose of obtaining the necessary revenues to meet current expenses. Our Republican friends have not indicated what plan should be adopted to secure adequate means to meet governmental expenses; but this much is certain, the amount obtained at our ports from customs will be but an inconsiderable fraction of the sum total of the Government's annual expenditures.

The able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] in an earnest and instructive address invited the attention of the Senate and the country to the great deficit which was imminent. Attention was directed to the enormous sum now collected from the people to meet the annual charges of the Government, but notwithstanding the more than \$5,000,000,000 spent during the last fiscal year, and a like amount that will be required to meet the demands of the next fiscal year, the Treasury is confronted with a deficit of \$2,000,000,000.

May I say, by way of parenthesis, that the Senator from North Dakota is one of the ablest men in public life and one of the most useful Members of our National Legislature. He has courageously attacked conditions which he regarded as productive of evil, and has advocated policies regardless of the views of his associates. During the recent war his strong and forceful speeches challenged the attention of the country to important problems, and doubtless affected the conduct of officials charged with executive responsibility. His vision is forward and his unquestioned sincerity and superb courage mark him as one of the strong men of this Republic. He has warned us, Mr. President, against extravagance, and has demanded retrenchment and economy in governmental administration. I venture to predict that his party during the next two years will be as deaf to his pleas for economy, as they are now proving to be. But the Senator from North Dakota, notwithstanding his transcendent virtues, is unable to free himself from the spell which the word "protectionism" casts over him. I do not wish to be unparliamentary or hypercritical, but may it not be truthfully suggested, that the highest statesmanship of Republican leaders finds expression in tariff legislation. It would seem that the Republican creed could be stated in two words: Tariff—protection. If an economic evil exists the pharmacopoeia to which the wise medicine men of that party resort has only the two words just stated; and if there is a foreign problem or some international complication, the Republican doctors have but the one remedy—tariff.

Mr. President, we are warranted in saying—how many crimes have been committed in the name of protection. The farmers have been fooled and the laboring classes have been deceived by this seductive word "protection."

I have known aliens after becoming naturalized to immediately affiliate with the Republican Party. They had been taught

in preparation for their naturalization examination that this was a Republic, and they therefore felt that in order to evince their interest in this Government and to furnish convincing proof of their loyalty to the Republic they were compelled to join the Republican Party. So the Republican Party has received many accretions to its ranks because of its name rather than its principles. The naturalized alien who did not have full opportunity to investigate the principles of the party and whose knowledge of the language was very imperfect was misled, and thus became a member of that organization. So there are many farmers and others who have been misled by the word "protection." It has seemed such an honest word, so suggestive of home and courage and fine qualities, that it has appealed to many voters, and they have followed this euphemistic word and have paid but scant attention to the party which was employing it or the principles upon which it rested. It seems a pity that a word that is so significant and so suggestive of splendid courage and many things should be so perverted and employed in defense of policies and methods so injurious and harmful.

We shall watch with interest, Mr. President, to see this "scientific" and "comprehensive" protection measure which is to emanate from the next Congress. Doubtless it will be a chef-d'œuvre. But, as I have stated, it will not be for revenue. What then will be its object? In whose interest is it being prepared? Who are to be the beneficiaries?

A suitable reply to these inquiries will be found, in my opinion, in a review of the McKinley, the Dingley, and the Payne-Aldrich tariff bills, and in the discovery of the interests which dictated them and the corporations and individuals who derived the greatest benefit therefrom. Even great Republicans rebelled against the iniquities of the Payne-Aldrich bill. Its schedules were denounced by distinguished Senators, some of whom still have seats upon the other side of the Chamber. It was shown by leading Republicans who desired to save their party from the infamy of such legislation that it favored special interests and permitted the exploitation of the American people.

In the recent campaign the Republican Party declared that there must be a reduction in prices. The Democratic administration was denounced because immediately following the war it had failed to bring prices down. Economic laws were disregarded by these critics, and the Democratic Party was charged with defaults and offenses of which it was not guilty. Every effort was made to conceal from the people the fact that the Republicans had been in control of Congress since March, 1919, and that the failure to enact legislation which would have reduced prices, assuming that such legislation were possible, was attributable to the Republican and not to the Democratic Party.

But now we are met with the demand from the Republicans that prices must be forced up, and they are fastening the responsibility for a decline in prices on some commodities upon the Democratic Party. The facility with which the Republican Party changes its position and performs acrobatic feats excites the wonder and amazement of all inquiring minds. In view of the record of the Republican Party in the past, will we not be justified in looking forward with deep concern as to its administrative policies when it assumes full control of the Government.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted to indulge in prophecy, I shall make bold to declare that when this so-called "scientific and comprehensive" Republican tariff bill is prepared, the interest of the masses of the American people will be disregarded, and the forces which dictated the McKinley and the Dingley and the Payne-Aldrich tariff bills will write its schedules.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] referred this morning to the pending dye bill. It was introduced during the last session and is now upon the calendar. The effect of this bill, if it becomes a law, would be to grant a monopoly to domestic producers. The interests of the public were not considered, in my opinion, in the drafting of the bill, and the users of domestic dyes were to be entirely at the mercy of the dye monopoly.

We have taken more than 2,800 patents dealing with dyes from Germany and have transferred them to a corporation for use by American dye producers. There is no competition from abroad under existing law, and notwithstanding all these advantages enjoyed by the American dye producers, there is a proposition which, if carried into effect will practically prohibit importations. Germany is prostrate. She lacks raw materials and her production of dyes is limited, indeed. It is possible she would supply a limited amount in order to buy bread to feed her starving children, but this Minotaur of protection, this huge giant which is being armed and equipped with destructive weapons, declares that none shall come to our shores.

Mr. President, protection, as interpreted by the reactionaries in the Republican Party, means restriction of trade and commerce. It means aid to trusts and favored corporations, to special interests, to forces which in the past have been beneficiaries of similar legislation and which are now demanding that their policies shall be adopted.

Mr. President, I now approach the question which I sought to present when interrupted by the Senator from North Dakota.

I presume that the attitude of the Senator from Maryland with respect to the Russian situation is reflected in part at least in a resolution offered by him and now being considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I obtained a copy of the resolution after the Senate convened this morning and I have hastily glanced at it during some of the interruptions to which my remarks have been subjected.

There are some things in the resolution from which no one would dissent. Reference is made to the "cordial relations which from time immemorial have existed between the United States and Russia." The resolution states that, because of the devotion of the American people to free institutions, the "citizens of the United States have long looked forward to the time when the people of Russia shall have established such free institutions for themselves." That is a correct statement of the attitude of the American people, and I hope that it was not the intention of the Senator to convey the thought that Russia had, under the bolshevik tyranny, established free institutions such as are enjoyed by the United States. The resolution further recites that the Russian people made "heroic sacrifices during the war and cooperated with the allied nations against Germany." It fails to state, however, that Lenin and Trotsky plotted with Germany, treachery to the Allies, and caused the Russian armies to desert the United States and the allied nations at a most critical period in the World War.

Of course, no one can fully appraise the great contribution made by the Russian people to the allied cause, which was their cause, up to the time when the communists by their treason and treachery obtained control of the Russian armies. The Russian people heroically battled with the allied nations against the Central Empires. With the overthrow of Kerensky and the provisional government and the seizure of the reins of government by Lenin and Trotsky and their communistic adherents, the Russian military forces fighting against Germany disintegrated and the communistic dictatorship became the ally of the Central Empires.

The Senator declares in his resolution that a separate peace was made with Germany because of the "incompetency and corruption of the autocratic government of Russia and its failure to supply munitions of war."

Mr. President, I think history will acquit the Czar of treachery and perfidy to his country or to the Allies in the Great War. That he was incompetent and lacked those qualities of leadership which so serious a crisis demanded, I think all will concede. He was a pitiful figure in the world; desiring to defeat Germany, he was unable to direct the military and industrial forces essential to a vigorous prosecution of the war. Moreover, he was surrounded by German agents and influences, and treasonable efforts were made by members of his own circle to either withdraw Russia from active participation in the war or reduce her military operations to impotent and inconclusive skirmishes. That his government had been autocratic and oppressive all will admit, nor can it be doubted that Russia was inadequately provided with needed munitions of war, and that hundreds of thousands of brave and suffering Russian soldiers were sent to the battle front without arms and without training. They fought bravely, and are entitled to our gratitude and the admiration of the world.

Russia's sufferings during the war and since call for profound sympathy. Anyone who reads her tragic page can not feel other than the deepest pity for Russia and her people. But when the Senator declares that a "separate peace" was made with Germany because of the lack of munitions or because of the incompetency and corruption of the Czaristic Government I think he can not find support in the record. The facts are that the treaty of Brest-Litovsk was not made for more than a year after the Czar's Government was overthrown, and the action of the bolsheviks in entering into the treaty was not approved by the patriotic leaders of the Russian people or by the great mass of the people themselves.

I have not the time to present the accumulated evidence that establishes beyond question that Lenin and Trotsky were the agents of Germany, and were sent by Germany and furnished gold by Germany in order that they might accomplish a coup d'état, and with the power so obtained demobilize the Russian armies and make a separate peace with Germany.

Undoubtedly Lenin believed the situation presented an opportunity to establish a communistic society in Russia. It was

not because of any particular friendship for Germany that he sought the defeat of the Allies. He knew that the withdrawal of Russia from the war at that critical period would jeopardize the chances of an allied victory and place Germany and her allies in a situation where they would be free to launch a formidable offensive against the allied forces in France and Belgium. The Russian people, of course, were tired of war. They did not know to whom they could look for leadership. The great mass of the people were still loyal to the Allies and earnestly desired that the cause for which Russia and the Allies had fought should be vindicated. But under the bloody dictatorship of Lenin and Trotsky, who had seized the reins of authority, in a helpless and hopeless way they withdrew from the contest. They did not intend to betray the Allies and the sacred cause for which they were fighting; but Lenin and Trotsky intended the betrayal of the Allies, and it was they and the communistic dictatorship which they established that made a separate peace with Germany.

The Senator declares that it is the desire of the people of the United States to continue friendly relations and to establish trade and commerce with the Russian people, that they desire to assist in the rehabilitation of the industrial and agricultural agencies of Russia, for the sake of the Russian people as well as for the general welfare of the world. I believe there will be but little controversy over this broad statement contained in the Senator's resolution. We do desire friendly relations with the people of Russia. The American people are anxious for Russia to be rehabilitated and for her distracted people to have the opportunity to return to the ways of peace and to follow those processes which will make for their prosperity, welfare, and liberty. The American people would rejoice if a suitable government were established in Russia and the principles of democracy could be realized in the lives of the people. The cruel, brutal, and merciless administration of the soviet dictatorship fills the American people with horror and excites their commiseration for those who are its victims. They will welcome the hour when the Russian people throw off the cruel militarism which is now oppressing them, and have full opportunity to develop the vast resources of their great State.

If the Senator means, however, by this statement and other statements in his resolution, that the American people desire to accord recognition to the soviet dictatorship, and wish that our Government shall enter into diplomatic relations with Lenin, then I must dissent from his position; and I make bold to declare that he is not supported by the American people.

The Senator's resolution further declares that no "unfriendly" act has been committed by the Russian people against the United States, but "on the contrary, the Russian people have borne with patience our unlawful invasion of their territory and intermeddling with their internal affairs."

Mr. President, I can subscribe to this statement if the Senator means that the great mass of the Russian people have committed no unfriendly act against the United States—unless it be the withdrawal from the war—I agree with him. The information is overwhelming that but a very small fraction of the Russian people belong to the communist party or are in sympathy with the bolshevik dictatorship. Writers who seek to condone the atrocities of the bolsheviks admit that there are not more than six or seven hundred thousand persons in all of Russia who accept the creed of the Communists.

The Baltic Provinces have withdrawn from Russia. In the Ukraine territory, where between thirty and forty millions of people reside, bolshevik authority is denied and revolts and uprisings are of constant occurrence. Siberia with its millions of people is loosely bound to the Moscow dictatorship, and the great mass of the Russian peasants regard with hatred the military despotism which intermittently plunders and never protects. Heterogeneous elements are united to perpetuate themselves in power, but there is no union born of common purposes and aspirations. Lenin may be sincere in believing that from communism may come a better world and improved economic conditions, but every page of the record of the bolshevik organization records atrocities and brutalities and cruelties that arouse the indignation of decent people everywhere and fill with anguish and sorrow the hearts of all who learn of the agonies and sufferings to which millions of the Russian people have been subjected. If the Senator means that the soviet dictatorship has committed no "unfriendly act against the United States," I most earnestly register my dissent from his position.

At this point I call the Senate's attention to a number of specific acts upon the part of our Government indicative of the friendship of the American people for Russia.

Immediately following the revolution in Russia which culminated in the overthrow of the Czar, a provisional government was organized under Kerensky. That government was recog-

nized by the United States, and our ambassador conferred with it, and the provisional government appointed Boris Bakhmeteff as Russian ambassador to the United States. The Kerensky government sought to continue the war and to carry out the obligations of Russia to the Allies. In a treacherous and cowardly manner the provisional government was overthrown, as I have stated, and the brutal dictatorship of Lenin and Trotski seized political authority in Russia. The President of the United States, in order that convincing proof might be furnished to the Russian people of the friendship entertained for them by the United States, appointed a mission to visit Russia and to convey to her people the expressions of sympathy and friendship in behalf of the American people. Elihu Root, a distinguished Republican leader, was named by President Wilson to head the commission. Mr. Root and the commission visited Russia and conveyed to the Russian people the message of good will and sympathy transmitted by the President of the United States. This commission sought in every honorable way to convince the Russian people of the high regard in which that nation was held by this Republic and of the sincere desire of the American people to aid them in the establishment of a stable government, under which freedom might be enjoyed by all. President Wilson, in a message to Congress, referred to the revolution in Russia and the sending of a delegation or commission to Russia. In the President's message the following appears:

In view of the approaching visit of the American delegation to Russia to express the deep friendship of the American people for the people of Russia and to discuss the best and most practical means of cooperation between the two peoples in carrying the present struggle for the freedom of all peoples to a successful consummation, it seems opportune and appropriate that I should state again, in the light of this new partnership, the objects the United States has had in mind in entering the war. Those objects have been very much belocuded during the past few weeks by mistaken and misleading statements, and the issues at stake are too momentous, too tremendous, too significant for the whole human race to permit any misinterpretations or misunderstandings, however slight, to remain uncorrected for a moment.

I desire to emphasize these words of the President: "In the light of this new partnership," President Wilson not only exhibits his deep interest in Russia but points to the fact that this great Republic regards Russia as a "partner" in the great enterprise of defeating imperial ambitions and furthering the cause of freedom on the earth.

Then the President, in strong and eloquent terms, states the objects which our country sought to attain:

We are fighting for the liberty, the self-government, and the undisturbed development of all peoples, and every feature of the settlement that concludes this war must be conceived and executed for that purpose. Wrongs must first be righted and then adequate safeguards must be created to prevent their being committed again. We ought not to consider remedies merely because they have a pleasing and sonorous sound. Practical questions can be settled only by practical means. Phrases will not accomplish the result. Effective readjustment will; and whatever readjustments are necessary must be made.

I ask Senators' attention to these noble sentiments:

The brotherhood of mankind must no longer be a fair but empty phrase; it must be given a structure of force and reality. The nations must realize their common life and effect a workable partnership to secure that life against the aggressions of autocratic and self-pleasing powers. For these things we can afford to pour out blood and our treasure.

These eloquent words of the President, defining the aims of this Republic in entering the war, made a profound impression throughout the world, and did much to maintain the morale of the allied forces and to secure the sympathy and support of neutral nations. Indeed, I think it can be safely asserted that the great papers of President Wilson and his presentation of the issues involved in the great conflict secured the adherence of many nations to the cause of the United States and the allied nations. At a later date President Wilson transmitted to the Russian people a most cordial greeting, and expressed the sincere sympathy of the people of the United States for the Russian people. In March, 1918, the following message was transmitted by the President to the American consul general at Moscow for delivery to the Russian Congress then meeting at that place:

May I not take advantage of the meeting of the Congress of the Soviets to express the sincere sympathy which the people of the United States feel for the Russian people at this moment when the German power has been thrust in to interrupt and turn back the whole struggle for freedom and substitute the wishes of Germany for the purposes of the people of Russia.

Although the Government of the United States is unhappily not now in a position to render the direct and effective aid it would wish to render, I beg to assure the people of Russia through the Congress that it will avail itself of every opportunity to secure for Russia once more complete sovereignty and independence in her own affairs, and full restoration to her great rôle in the life of Europe and the modern world.

The whole heart of the people of the United States is with the people of Russia in the attempt to free themselves forever from autocratic government and become the masters of their own life.

This sincere declaration of friendship for the Russian people and the promise to aid them in every possible way in securing

their independence, should have left no doubt, if there was any occasion for doubt, of the disinterested friendship entertained by this Republic for the Russian people. But the reply to this message from Lenin and his associates furnishes convincing proof of their deep and deadly enmity toward this Government. The offers of friendship and support were treated with contempt, and the message sent in reply was, in effect, a declaration of war against the United States as well as all other nations. The following is the reply:

The all-Russian congress of soviets expresses its appreciation to the American people, and first of all to the laboring and exploited classes in the United States for the message sent by the President of the United States to the congress of the soviets in this time when the Russian socialistic soviet republic is living through most difficult trials.

The Russian Republic uses the occasion of the message from President Wilson to express to all peoples who are dying and suffering from the horrors of this imperialistic war its warm sympathy and firm conviction that the happy time is near when the laboring masses in all bourgeois countries will throw off the capitalist yoke and establish a socialistic state of society, which is the only one capable of assuring a permanent and just peace as well as the culture and well-being of all who toil.

Senators will observe that the Lenin régime is spoken of as "the Russian Republic." All who are familiar with the proceedings at Moscow and in Russia will recall that a meeting of the Russian congress was held at Moscow.

A majority of the members were not in accord with Lenin's communistic views. They believed in a constitutional government and in the rule of the majority and were opposed to the dictatorship which Lenin sought to impose upon the people in order that he might destroy all forms of government in Russia and force upon the people his communistic dictatorship. His reply was an insult to the President and the American people. His reference to the "happy time when the laboring masses in the bourgeois countries would throw off the capitalistic yoke" was an expression of his purpose and the purpose of his communistic supporters to destroy all governments and bring the peoples of the world under a communistic régime.

Upon other occasions our Government and the American people have manifested their interest in Russia and their desire for the welfare and happiness of the Russian people. Only recently President Wilson, in a paper of great power, appealed to the nations of Europe in behalf of Russia. While some of the Governments of Europe have recognized the newly established Governments erected in the Baltic Provinces and constituting a part of Russian territory, our Government has declined to accord them even a de facto recognition; and the same is true of the Republics of Georgia and Azerbaijan. The President's position is that nothing should be done which indicates a purpose upon the part of this Nation to dismember Russia or to approve a policy which might be opposed to the wishes of the Russian people. Russia has no truer friend than President Wilson, and the Russian people will find no people more sincerely desirous of aiding them than those who have experienced freedom in this Republic.

The Senator from Maryland declares in his resolution that the Russian people "have borne with patience our unlawful invasion of their territory and intermeddling with their internal affairs." Mr. President, I deny that there has been any "invasion" of Russian territory or that our Government has "intermeddled in Russia's internal affairs." Russia was our ally. This Republic and Russia, with the other allied nations, were battling against a common foe.

The United States and the Allies were furnishing Russia resources with which she could aid in the prosecution of the war. Loans to the extent of billions were made to the Russian Government. Military and naval supplies to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars were delivered by the allied nations at Russian ports, both upon the White Sea and upon the Pacific coast. Most of these supplies had not been paid for at the time the bolsheviks overthrew the provisional government. The treaty of Brest-Litovsk was negotiated by the treacherous dictatorship that assumed to speak for Russia. That treaty did not represent the wishes of the Russian people. It was a wicked betrayal of them, as it was a treacherous betrayal of this Republic and the allied powers. Under that treaty the bolshevik dictatorship became an ally of Germany and a foe to the United States and the nations associated with her in the Great War. German officials as well as German officers were given positions of responsibility in Russia, and Count Von Mirbach was sent to Moscow for the purpose of securing aid from the bolsheviks to be employed against the allied forces. Efforts were made by the bolsheviks to prevent the Czechoslovakian troops, then in Russia, from departing therefrom in order that they might take their place in the fighting line as soldiers in the allied cause. In other words, the bolsheviks made war upon those who were our allies. They delivered to the German Government war vessels in the Black Sea and gave aid and encouragement to the Central Empires. Proof has been adduced that a portion of

the vast military stores upon the Murmansk coast furnished by the United States to the allied Governments were placed at the disposal of Germany and used by her against the allied forces. The Senator, I presume, when he speaks of the "invasion" of their territory, refers to the military expeditions sent to the north of Russia and into Siberia. I have directed attention to the fact that the military supplies at various points upon the White Sea, in the north of Russia, were enormous in quantity and of very great value. Those supplies would have been of incalculable benefit to our enemy, and if Germany had obtained them it would have postponed the termination of the war and resulted in the death of thousands of American soldiers.

The bolshevik régime actively associated itself with the German military authorities for the purpose of delivering to Germany these vast stores and also to enable Germany to establish one or more naval submarine bases upon the Murmansk coast, from which she might send her submarines into the Atlantic Ocean, there to prey upon our commerce and attack the transports conveying our troops to the battle line in France. It was a bold plan upon the part of Germany to obtain these military stores and to transport by rail her submarine boats to the northern coast of Russia, and from thence send them out into the Atlantic Ocean to attack our transports and murder our soldiers. The bolsheviks actively participated in the execution of this design. A railroad was being completed that would connect the Baltic Sea with the northern coast of Russia, and bolshevik troops were being pushed to the north for the purpose of seizing the military stores which I have mentioned, and to construct one or more suitable submarine bases. The situation called for action.

The great mass of the Russian people were unaware of the treachery of the bolshevik government, or the aid which it was rendering to the Central Empires. Gen. Foch was the military commander of the allied forces. President Wilson, perhaps more than any other person, deserves the credit for having brought about that result. Unity of command was imperatively required, and the influence of President Wilson secured that result. Gen. Foch ordered a small military force to the northern coast of Russia for the purpose of protecting the military stores referred to and to prevent Germany from carrying out her design of establishing submarine bases along the coast of the White Sea. In that expedition were a few American troops. Great Britain furnished some and France the remainder. They landed upon the north coast of Russia, not as invaders, not as trespassers, and not to interfere with the Russian people or "intermeddle," as the Senator expresses it, in the internal affairs of Russia. This action prevented Germany and the bolsheviks from carrying out their nefarious designs.

I invite the attention of Senators to this further fact, that at the time when the military expedition was ordered to Russia, there was a government opposed to the bolshevik régime operating in a number of northern provinces of Russia. It was exercising authority and functioning as a government.

There were several millions of people within the territory over which this provisional government exercised authority. This government and the people within it welcomed the allied forces and gave them support; measured by all political standards, it was more entitled to recognition than the bolshevik régime. It more nearly represented the views of the Russian people than did the dictatorship of Lenin and Trotsky, and it had a better right to speak for Russia than did the small minority which maintained itself by guerilla warfare and the use of German, Austrian, and Chinese soldiers and wild and savage forces held together by rapine and plunder. It is not sufficient answer to say that later this government was overthrown by the soviet dictatorship. Under every principle of international law the allied forces could not be regarded as invaders or trespassers, or as infringing upon the territory of a neutral power. Indeed, this provisional government, which controlled at that time the northern Provinces of Russia, was an ally. Its forces, limited though they were, were aiding the Allies and desired the success of the cause which had brought Russia into the Great War in August, 1914.

Mr. President, I regret that any American should charge that our Government unlawfully invaded Russian territory. In my opinion, the charge is unfounded. Would the Senator, or others who share his views, have sat quietly by and permitted our German foe and the bolsheviks, who had so treacherously betrayed us, to possess themselves of these vast military stores which would have prolonged the war and led to the death of thousands of American and allied soldiers? Would the Senator have taken no steps to prevent the launching of submarines in Russian ports in order that they might intercept our ships and

send our troops to ocean graves? One can scarcely believe that such would have been his course.

There is another view that must also be considered in dealing with this question. Siberia is Russian territory. Millions of Siberian people had not given adhesion to the soviet dictatorship. They had local governments of more or less authority, and these governments still desired the defeat of Germany and the success of the allied cause. They were more entitled to speak for the Russian people than were the few thousand bolsheviks who claimed authority over the Russian people. They welcomed allied troops into Siberia in order that they might protect the Czechoslovakian troops, the destruction of which was sought by Germany and the bolsheviks. They were opposed to seizure by Germany or the bolsheviks of the military supplies then upon the Murmansk coast as well as those which were stored at Vladivostok, and which had been furnished by the United States and the allied Governments for Russia. The stores at Vladivostok were important and they had not been paid for. They belonged to the allied Governments and the Russian people were desirous that such stores should be protected by allied forces in order that they might not fall into the hands of the Germans or the bolsheviks. The allied troops which landed in Siberia were there by the consent of the Russian people. To all intents and purposes, the great mass of the Russian people were our allies, though they were unable to afford military aid. It is a travesty and a mockery to speak of the soviet dictatorship as being the Russian people or the Russian Government.

Nor must the fact be overlooked that there were over a million German and Austrian prisoners of war in Russia east of the Ural Mountains. The bolsheviks and the central empires were attempting to return these prisoners that they might again enter the ranks of the German and Austrian armies. The allied Governments felt, as did the local provisional governments of Russia and the Russian people, that proper efforts should be made by the allied nations to prevent the carrying out of this plan.

And so, Mr. President, Russian provisional governments and the Russian people approved of the course of the United States and the allied nations in sending military expeditions to the north of Russia and to Siberia. The Senator's resolution is a condemnation of the course of our Government, and necessarily that of our allies, in adopting measures in the interest of Russia and the Russian people, as well as in the interest of the nations associated with this Republic in the great struggle for their preservation and the preservation of civilization. In the light of these circumstances, and others which could be mentioned, I insist that there was no "invasion" of Russian territory and no interference with her "internal affairs." I might add in this connection that the instructions given to Gen. Graves, who was in charge of the American forces in Siberia, explicitly forbade his interference in any way in the domestic and internal affairs or government of the Russian people. Similar instructions were given by Gen. Foch to the expeditionary forces that were landed upon the Murmansk coast.

I referred a few moments ago to the fact there were one or more governments in Russian territory east of the Ural Mountains when allied troops reached Siberia; as a matter of fact, there was a functioning government established in Archangel August 1, 1918.

I am utterly unable to comprehend the attitude of those who assume that the United States made war upon Russia because of a landing of a few soldiers at Archangel and Murmansk upon the Arctic coast for the purpose to which I have referred. Those who exhibit so much concern in regard to this matter are not disturbed because of the attacks made by guerilla bolsheviks upon our soldiers, culminating in the death of a number of them. I have called attention to the fact that the Russian people never entertained the thought that war was being made upon them by the United States or the allied nations. The most friendly relations existed between our soldiers and the Russians, and it is historic fact that a number of Russian girls intermarried with American soldiers.

The American forces which arrived at Archangel September 4, 1918, were withdrawn from Russia in June, 1919. During all this period the northern Provinces, those in which the allied troops were temporarily located, were controlled by a Russian provincial government, and it was not until February 20, 1920, more than eight months after the withdrawal of the American troops, that the bolsheviks overthrew such government. It is also a fact that the bolsheviks never declared war on the United States and never recognized the existence of a state of war because of the presence of American soldiers at Archangel or in Siberia.

The attacks made by guerilla bolsheviks did not constitute war between States. The bolsheviks were not an independent State, and the conception of war in international law is confined to such cases; as it is commonly said, the only parties to a war are independent States.

"Contention with pirates is not recognized as war by independent States of the world, because pirates constitute an organization or body of men, which, according to the views of these independent States, is not sufficiently responsible and organized to be allowed to indulge in international violence." A belligerent body is not a party to a war; that is, it is not regarded as engaged in permitted international violence until its belligerency has been recognized. Private armed bodies are not recognized as entitled to engage in violence, and privateers, while formerly extensively employed, are not parties to a war nor agents for the conduct of hostilities. Pirates are not independent States, and have no standing in international law as such, and may be dealt with by any State which seizes them. They have no international standing and can not perform an international act, therefore they can not engage in war. (Fulke, "A Treatise on International Law," vol. 2, p. 129 et seq.)

If there was any government in Russia or any part of Russia at the time allied troops landed in Russia having political capacity to make or declare war or the right under international law to carry on war, it was not the bolsheviks but the provisional governments found in various parts of Russia, including northern Russia as well as in Russian territory east of the Ural Mountains.

As I have stated, these governments regarded the American and allied military forces as friends and allies and not as enemies. Nor must it be forgotten that Lenin and Trotsky undertook to repudiate the former debts of the recognized government of Russia, and in March, 1918, they undertook to make a separate peace with Germany, and, indeed, entered into a perfidious and ignominious treaty which attempted to partition Russia and make the bolsheviks a dependency of Germany.

The United States and the Allies have saved Russia from the ignominy to which these bolshevik enemies of the Russian people and the Russian nation attempted to subject her; and yet notwithstanding these great services to Russia and the Russian people, we have some in our midst who regard the presence of a few friendly soldiers upon the frozen Arctic coast of Russia as a greater wrong to Russia and her people than all the impositions and cruelties and atrocities accomplished by the bolsheviks.

I repeat the United States has not undertaken to interfere with the internal affairs of Russia or the Russian people, and it has no purpose so to do. It is against the traditional policy of this Nation to intervene in the domestic policies of European States.

On the 5th of August, 1918, the Government of the United States issued a statement containing the following words:

As the Government of the United States sees the present circumstances, therefore, military action is admissible in Russia now only to render such protection and help as is possible to the Czechoslovaks against the armed Austrian and German prisoners who are attacking them and to steady any efforts at self-government or self-defense in which the Russians themselves may be willing to accept assistance. Whether from Vladivostok or from Murmansk and Archangel, the only present object for which American troops will be employed will be to guard military stores which may subsequently be needed by Russian forces and to render such aid as may be acceptable to the Russians in the organization of their own self-defense.

It was further declared that:

In taking this action the Government of the United States wishes to announce to the people of Russia in the most public and solemn manner that it contemplates no interference with the political sovereignty of Russia, no intervention in her internal affairs—not even in the local affairs of the limited areas which her military force may be obliged to occupy—and no impairment of her territorial integrity, either now or hereafter, but that what we are about to do has as its single and only object the rendering of such aid as shall be acceptable to the Russian people themselves in their endeavors to regain control of their own affairs, their own territory, and their own destiny.

Mr. President, I have already shown that upon various occasions the President conveyed messages of sympathy to the Russian people and expressed the desire that cordial relations and friendly intercourse should exist between this Republic and the Russian people. His efforts to bring about such results have been opposed by the bolshevik dictatorship, and it has adopted a policy which has prevented the Russian people from producing in order that they might trade, and from trading in the event that they produced.

On the 10th of August, 1920, the Secretary of State, speaking for this Government in a communication to the Italian ambassador, stated that—

From the beginning of the Russian Revolution in March, 1917, to the present moment, the Government of the people of the United States has watched its development with friendly solicitude and profound sympathy for the efforts of the Russian people to reconstruct their national life upon the broad basis of popular self-government. The Government of the United States, reflecting the spirit of its people,

has at all times desired to help the Russian people. In that spirit all its relations with Russia and with other nations in matters affecting the latter's interests have been conceived and governed.

Mr. Colby, the Secretary of State, further declares:

While deeply regretting the withdrawal of Russia from the war at a critical time, and the disastrous surrender at Brest-Litovsk, the United States has fully understood that the people of Russia were in no wise responsible.

The United States maintains unimpaired its faith in the Russian people, in their high character, and their future. That they will overcome the existing anarchy, suffering, and destitution we do not entertain the slightest doubt. The distressing character of Russia's transition has many historical parallels, and the United States is confident that restored, free, and united Russia will again take a leading place in the world, joining with the other free nations in upholding peace and orderly justice.

Relative to the friendship and the feeling of honorable obligation to Russia which guided this Nation in its refusal to recognize as separate nations the Baltic Provinces and the so-called Republics of Georgia and Azerbaijan, carved out of Russian territory, the Secretary states:

These illustrations show with what consistency the Government of the United States has been guided in its foreign policy by a loyal friendship for Russia. We are unwilling that while it is helpless in the grip of a nonrepresentative government, whose only sanction is brutal force, Russia shall be weakened still further by a policy of dismemberment conceived in other than Russian interests.

The Secretary also states that there is no desire on the part of the United States to interfere—

in the internal affairs of the Russian people or to suggest what kind of government they should have.

It is true in this powerful State paper it is made clear that there will be no recognition of the soviet régime, and reasons appealing to patriotic Americans and fair-minded people everywhere are set forth in a masterly manner which justify the refusal of the United States to accord recognition to a régime which is without the pale of international law.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. FRANCE. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. FRANCE. The question is the same, I may observe, which I asked the Senator from Utah some months ago. Was not Russia a neutral country at that time?

Mr. KING. The great bulk of the Russian people did not desire to make war upon us; they did not desire to see the Central Empire triumph; but the military dictatorship of Russia, the Lenin and Trotsky government, as the Senator from Maryland denominates their military dictatorship, did desire to make war upon the United States as well as upon all governments, and were openly aiding the Germans to defeat the allied Governments.

Mr. FRANCE. Does the Senator hold that the desire to make war and the making of war are the same thing?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I affirm that there was not only the desire on the part of the bolsheviks to make war but their acts, if they were a government, were acts of war; the acts of belligerents and not the acts of neutrals. If the Senator from Maryland can find in the conduct of Lenin and Trotsky immediately following their betrayal of the Allies the acts of neutrals or of a neutral government—assuming that they are a government—I confess that his understanding of neutrality is different from mine and will find no support in international law.

Mr. FRANCE. I should be very glad, indeed, if the Senator from Utah would care to do so, to have him state for the Record any acts of war on the part of the Russian Government or on the part of the Russian people against us. I was not aware that any state of belligerency had been created by the Russians before we ourselves created it by the invasion of their territory.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator deny that Lenin and Trotsky cooperated with the Germans and aided them in their war against us and our allies? Is it not war against us when it is waged against our allies and against the line of battle in which our troops are found?

Mr. FRANCE. I am of the opinion, if the Senator from Utah desires to have me answer that question, that there is grave doubt as to whether they did so aid the Germans.

I think there is much evidence to show that the de facto government of Russia did much to persuade the German people to overthrow their militaristic government; and I think there is much to show that there was propaganda going on in Germany, which was carried on by the Russians, which tended to make the German people dissatisfied with their militaristic government and with the policies of that government. I think it is a very debatable question as to whether or not the Russians were belligerents against us.

However, my point was this, if the Senator will allow me to state it: If Russia was neutral territory, then our invasion of Russia was practically a violation of Russian neutrality comparable to the German invasion of Belgium, which was neutral territory. If Russia was not a neutral country, but was a belligerent country, which had acted as a belligerent against us, the proper method for us to have pursued would have been to declare war against Russia. I have been unable to follow the Senator in his defense of the invasion of Russia without a declaration of war, either on the ground that Russia was a neutral or on the ground that Russia had committed acts of belligerency against us. When the Germans acted as belligerents against us, we declared war; if Russia did the same thing, Congress should have taken under consideration those acts; and if Congress had found that those acts were acts of war against us, we should have declared war.

I should be very glad to have the Senator take this occasion, if he will, to explain on what theory we were justified in invading Russian territory. Either on the theory that Russia was neutral or on the theory that Russia was a belligerent—granting either of those premises, either that Russia was a neutral or that she was a belligerent—it seems to me that it was for us to declare war before invading Russian territory.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is a student and knows that wars have been carried on without declarations of war. It does not need a declaration of war in order that war may be conducted. Acts may bring about war. Germany's acts upon the high seas, when her submarines lurking in the waters sunk American ships and killed hundreds of Americans, were acts of war. When Germany sent her spies into our midst to plot against our industrial peace, when she sought through the Zimmerman note and otherwise to inflame Mexico against the United States and induce her to join with Germany against us, these were acts of war, and it needed no declaration of war upon the part of the United States in order that it might, conformable to international law, make war upon Germany and meet the attacks which for months had been made upon the sovereignty of this Nation and upon the American people.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. I will yield first to the Senator from Maryland, and then I will yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wish to ask this question: Was it not also true, in addition to what the Senator from Utah has just said, that immediately previous to that time Germany had entered into relationship with Russia by which Russia had become, under the soviet rule, virtually a part of Germany?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, all Senators know that Count von Mirbach was in Moscow with German troops and was attempting to mobilize Russian troops for the purpose of employing them against the allied forces.

I have pointed out some of the acts of the soviets which would constitute acts of war if they could be considered a government. It was an act of war to turn over to the German Government the Russian fleet that was in the Black Sea, and also to aid Germany to capture the hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of munitions of war on the Murmansk coast. Of course, I am assuming that the bolsheviks possessed such an organization or structure as would under international law entitle them to be called a government. But I have argued that they had no government, but their status was much like that of pirates. Russia proper was an ally and the Russian people were our allies. If the provisional governments to which I have referred were not our allies, then they were friendly neutrals, and we were in Russia as allies or as invitees.

I distinguish between the bolsheviks and Russia and the Russian people. I admit that if the Lenin régime was a government, then there was a declaration of war, so far as acts can constitute a declaration of war, when the soviet government conspired and agreed with Germany that Germany should transport over Russian territory troops and submarines to naval bases that were to be established on the White Sea, in order that the submarines might be used to destroy American commerce and American soldiers upon the Atlantic Ocean. It was a declaration of war against the United States and the allied nations.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEFLIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. FRANCE. I am quite aware of the fact that a state of war can be created without any declaration of war, and that a foreign country can make war upon this country without any

formal declaration of war by this country; but I have also been under the impression—an impression gained by a reading of the Constitution of the United States—that the United States can not enter upon a state of war against another country without a declaration of war by the Congress. Do I understand the Senator from Utah to be contending that the United States itself can enter upon a state of war against another nation without a declaration of war by the Congress? If that doctrine is admitted, of course, the sending of troops to Russia was not illegal; but I have certainly been under the impression that this country could not create a state of war against another country without a declaration of war by the Congress. I think it is very important for us to have that point made clear.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have stated, and I repeat, that the soviet dictatorship by its acts, by its cooperation with Germany, by its conspiracies with Germany to obtain the military stores owned by the Allies, but situate upon Russian territory, and to use Russian territory and waters as bases for military and naval operations against the Allies, declared war, so far as acts can constitute a declaration of war, against the United States and the allied nations, including Russia itself; and I contend that, in view of the conditions which I have mentioned and in view of the fact that bolshevik soldiers were in the German Army and under the control of German officers, and the further fact that territory controlled by the soviets was being used for military and naval operations against the United States and the Allies, including Russia, there was no impropriety, but, upon the contrary, the conduct of Foch was justified by international law, in protecting the military supplies referred to and preventing the execution of Germany's military and naval plans. Does my friend from Maryland justify the soviets in entering into a conspiracy with our enemies to turn over to them Russian territory to be used as a naval base?

Does the Senator from Maryland justify the perfidy of Lenin and Trotsky and the soviet government in forming an alliance with Germany and agreeing that upon Russian territory submarines should be constructed and that from Russian ports they should depart to prey upon American commerce and murder the boys sent by this Government, some from the Senator's own State, to uphold upon the fields of Flanders and of France the honor of this Nation and the cause of freedom for which this Republic was contending? Does he justify that?

The attitude of the Senator, if I have understood him—and if I do him an injustice I tender sincere apologies—has been that the United States should accord recognition to the soviet power of Russia. He is insisting now in the joint resolution introduced by him that the President is hereby advised:

(1) To instruct the Department of State to raise the embargo against the shipment of goods to Russia.

Of course that is innocuous, for there is no embargo except against munitions. Does the Senator want our Government to send munitions to the bolsheviks? He has declared in his resolution that he wants the President to instruct the Department of State to raise the embargo against the shipment of goods to Russia, but the only embargo against the shipment of goods to Russia is the embargo—and that is only a qualified one—against munitions of war. If the Senator from Maryland is interested in sending munitions of war to the soviet authority for use by their troops in butchering the Russian people or attacking Poland, if he will make application to the Department of State, it is barely possible that the Department of State may give the Senator, because he is a Senator, permission for their shipment.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FRANCE. The Senator has been very kind in allowing me to trespass upon his time, and for that reason I venture to trespass upon his time once more to clear up this most important question—the question as to how the United States enters upon a state of war.

The Senator stated that the Russian Government had for months been acting as a belligerent against this country, and that therefore this country was in a state of war against Russia. I cite to him the parallel case of Germany. Germany had been committing acts of war against this country for many months. I may say that other European countries had been committing acts against this country which were hostile to this country, but Germany in particular had been committing acts of war against this Government—acts of war which were condoned for many months, contrary, I think, to the judgment of the Senator from Utah and contrary to my judgment, under a policy with which I did not agree. Those acts of belligerency on the part of Germany, however, did not put us at war with Germany, and it was not until a formal declaration of war by

the Congress that the Commander in Chief of our armies was authorized to invade German territory in retaliation for those acts of war against us.

It seems to me it is very important for us to clear up this doubt which seems to exist as to how the United States should enter upon war. Even though it be granted that the Russian Government had committed acts of war against us—something which I do not grant, it not being material to this discussion, however—does the Senator think that that put this country in a state of war against Russia? And if he thinks that, does he think that the committing of acts of belligerency on the part of the Germans against us put us into war against Germany? And does he think that just as our troops invaded Russia, so, because Germany had committed acts of belligerency against us, our troops might have invaded German territory without our formally declaring a state of war to exist?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think I have answered that, but let me say this: Germany's acts did constitute war upon the United States. We could have gone to war without a declaration of war. We preferred to and did declare war. The Senator knows that the war between Russia and Japan in 1904 and 1905 occurred without a declaration of war. Japan attacked the Russians without a declaration of war.

Now, Mr. President, let me give a simple example to illustrate where the Senator's contention would lead us.

Suppose that Mexico and the United States were allies in a war against the Central American powers. Assume that the latter were more powerful than they are, and that we had large military stores in Mexico for the purpose of transshipment to our troops which were then on the borders of Central America, fighting the common foe; and suppose, that some element of the Mexican people attempted to betray their own country and the United States and for that purpose entered into an agreement with the enemy to deliver to them the military stores, and to co-operate in an attack upon our soldiers, and our military commander on the Rio Grande saw that a movement was on foot which, if unchecked, would result in such being captured by the enemy: Does the Senator think it would be the duty of the President of the United States, or Congress, or our military commander to take no action for the protection of such stores, and to meet the threatened attack? Though the common foe entered upon Mexican soil, through the treachery of some of the forces of our ally, it would be the duty, I assert, of our military commander to protect our military supplies, and to take all necessary steps to defeat their attacks. And no declaration of war would be necessary, nor would the acts of our armies be in contravention of the Constitution.

Let me put another illustration. Suppose that the United States and the allied nations had had vessels in the Black Sea prior to and at the time the Kerensky government was overthrown; and that the bolsheviks, cooperating with the Germans, attempted to deliver such ships to Germany, and the latter endeavored to take possession of the same to use them against this Nation and our allies.

Does the Senator say that it would be improper, in violation of the Constitution or of international law, for our military and naval commanders and the military and naval commanders of the allied forces to employ force to prevent the consummation of the treacherous plan even though in so doing they had to land troops upon Russian soil? Mr. President, my good friend from Maryland would have sat idly by, if I understand his position, and permitted the bolsheviks and Germans to complete their railroad line to the Murman coast, seize the military stores there held, transport submarines over the completed road and launch them upon the waters of the Russian Sea that they might destroy our transports and send thousands of our soldiers to their death.

President Wilson and Gen. Foch did not approve of that policy. Troops were sent to prevent the consummation of a plan that would have proven disastrous to the allied cause. They went there for that purpose. The Senator condemns it and says it was an invasion of Russian soil and an intermeddling with Russian affairs.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. FRANCE. I wish to make one observation, if the Senator will permit me, and that is that there is nothing either in my public statements upon this floor or in my statements elsewhere to indicate that I have ever plead for the soviets. While I have learned, particularly since I have been privileged to be in the Senate and since I have been privileged to hear the words of the distinguished author of "The New Freedom," to give a certain amount of consideration to the interests of the people of other countries, in any policy which I may advocate I have

been thinking only of our own country. It seemed to me to be my clear duty always to look after the interests of our own country first and foremost, and, I may say, when any question between this Nation and another nation is involved, our own American interests exclusively. So I have never been pleading for Russia; and if the Senator will allow me to make one further observation, I will say that the very purpose of the policy which I have advocated toward Russia has been to prevent the driving of Russia and Germany together, and their interweaving with each other financially, economically, industrially, and politically.

I have thought it was unwise to formulate and to carry forward any policy which might seem to be one which would drive the Germans and the Russians together into political and financial and economic harmony and unity; and I may say that one of my chief arguments against the League of Nations was the argument that it tended to set up a coalition in the west against a coalition which certainly would be invited, if not actually started, between Germany, Russia, China, and perhaps some of the other oriental countries.

I may say to the Senator that I indicated the other day that while I am interested in the material side of this question, while I am interested in the promotion of American trade in competition with British trade, while I deplore the fact that Great Britain has preempted the great Russian markets, the thought of the material considerations is not wholly what has prompted my advocating this policy. It is, however, the thought that we should formulate a policy which will tend to bring into friendly relationships the two great peoples of the United States and of Russia, looking forward, as I do, to the time when there will be a feeling of enmity against us on the part of Japan, if it does not already exist, looking forward to the time when we should have in Europe a natural friend and ally of the most powerful kind. In view of the fact that the great people of Russia are now finding their freedom and seeking to establish a republic, which they soon will establish, I hope, along lines which have been already indicated by us in the establishment of this one, looking forward to their forming a republic, I have eagerly sought to see a policy formulated which would bring these two great republics into friendly relations, feeling that if Russia, the United States, and perhaps China should be in friendly and cordial relationships we would thus offset the enmity of Japan and indeed make it impossible for Japan or another great empire in Europe which might associate itself with Japan to move against us.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall come to the matter which the Senator has just developed a little later in my remarks; namely, the effect of the soviet efforts to secure an alliance with China. I have data here showing the activity of the bolsheviks in China and their efforts to cooperate with China, not for the latter's good but to bring her under communistic rule. I have no doubt, as the Senator says, that the soviets now are attempting to breed discord between Japan and the United States, between Japan and China, and to form a sort of an alliance with China, not, as I said, for China's good but that she might be the base for soviet activity against Japan, Australia, India, and the United States; but I shall come to that a little later.

Recurring to the question of the rightfulness of our troops upon Russian soil, I repeat what I stated a few minutes ago. The soviets occupied the status of pirates in international law; but conceding they were a de facto power, they did not represent the Russian people nor have possession of all of Russia's territory. They made war upon Russia and the provisional government of the Russia people. Our troops were upon Russian soil—not bolshevik territory—and were there as the allies of the Russian people. There was no invasion, and while rightfully on Russian soil they were attacked by guerrilla bands of bolsheviks, who also attacked Russian people and Russian troops.

Mr. President, I do not for a moment question the patriotism or the good motives of my distinguished friend from Maryland. He and I agree upon too many matters for me to do that. We agree, I think, upon the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States. We have deplored the tendencies to drift away from constitutional limitations. There is no man in this Chamber, so far as I know, who is more truly devoted to the preservation of constitutional government than the able Senator from Maryland, and I would not do him an injustice. I would rather do an injustice to myself, because I know his sincerity and patriotism. Yet, I am constrained to differ from him and to say that his resolution and the admirably phrased and eloquent addresses upon Russian questions which he has delivered here from time to time will not be calculated to accomplish with respect to Russia what he designs.

The Senator says he hopes to avert a union between Russia and Germany, for our good. That is wise statesmanship, and I applaud the purpose of the Senator. Yet, Mr. President, he

must know that the triumph of Lenin and Trotsky and the soviet government in Russia, and the submission of the 170,000,000 of Russians to their domination, would mean within a short time resuscitation of the Sparticides and the recrudescence of revolutionary forces in Germany, which, cooperating with the soviet forces of Russia, would probably destroy Germany. I fear the Senator's resolution will be misconstrued, and that it will give aid and comfort to the bolsheviks, strengthen their hands, and tend to defeat the purpose which my friend says he has in view.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. FRANCE. May I ask if the Senator from Utah fears that that propaganda might overthrow our Government?

Mr. KING. No.

Mr. FRANCE. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because some Senators seem to be suffering from a fear that such a propaganda might succeed in overthrowing our Government, and I was about to quote the statement of a British statesman to the effect that he had no fear of that propaganda disturbing the foundations of the British Government. However, I will not read the quotation now, as the Senator and the British statesman seem to be in agreement, both having faith in the stability of free institutions to exist against such an insidious propaganda.

Mr. KING. May I propound a question to my friend?

Mr. FRANCE. Yes.

Mr. KING. I do not believe, nor does he, that the bolshevist propaganda in the United States can overthrow this Republic. With that premise, let me ask the Senator this question: Does the Senator, notwithstanding his conviction of the permanency of our Government, believe that we ought to permit aliens to come into our midst who declare their purpose to work economic disorder, disturb our industrial life, and promote strikes, with the ultimate view of destroying our Government, in order that the so-called working classes may take over the Government itself? Does he think there ought not to be restrictions upon immigration against such persons?

Mr. FRANCE. I do not think so. We have a statute which prevents the coming to our shores of anarchists who come here for the purpose of spreading the doctrines of anarchy. I think it is well within our power to regulate immigration, and I think we should regulate it in such a way that anarchists should not be permitted to come here for the spreading of those doctrines. However, if there be any here who are inclined to teach anarchy, I think it is our privilege and duty to show them the error of their way, something which is very easily done in most instances, anarchy generally originating in ignorance.

Mr. KING. The Senator must know that those who are most active in bringing about industrial disorder and in promoting industrial discontent, and who are seeking to overthrow this Republic, are not the ignorant men he would have us believe; many of them are highly educated. They have pride in being regarded as intellectuals and are familiar with Karl Marx and Bakunin and Lenin, and the communistic and anarchistic literature which now floods the world, and they claim superior knowledge in regard to economic and political questions. The educational work of my good friend upon that class would be as powerless to influence their lives as our debate here to-day is to affect the movements of the stars.

Mr. FRANCE. If the Senator will yield, Mr. President, I will say that when I referred to the ignorance of the anarchists I referred to their ignorance of American institutions. They are learned in the forms of government of Europe, and they are also learned in the remedy which they think it necessary to apply in order to correct the evils of those governments. But they are not familiar with the great machinery of government which we have here, a machinery of government which, if properly utilized, will prevent those very evils which create anarchists and anarchy.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am interested in knowing the educational process which the Senator would employ in dealing with Emma Goldman and Berkman, and people of that class, and that is the class at whom the deportation statute is aimed. I fancy the Senator from Maryland would soon give up in despair all efforts to Americanize the class of persons to whom I have referred.

Mr. President, the Senator asked me whether I believed that this propaganda would overthrow our Republic, and I stated that I did not. At the same time I approve of the act of October 16, 1918, to which the Senator referred, which forbids the coming to our shores of anarchists, or those who believe in the use of force and violence for the overthrow of this Republic.

The same statute also provides for the deportation of that class. I would deport them if they managed to evade the law and get into the United States.

During our discussion the other day the Senator spoke in a complimentary way, as I understood him, of Secretary Wilson and Mr. Post. I criticized these officials and expressed the view that they were entirely too sympathetic toward those who came within the act of October 11, 1918, and had not been vigilant enough in enforcing its provisions.

In view of our previous discussion, and the present reference to aliens and their activities against our Government, I desire to call attention to Secretary Wilson's vigorous and admirable letter dealing with the deportation statute and Mr. Martens, who claimed to represent the bolshevist organization in the United States. The Senate ordered an investigation to learn why he was not deported, and after an exhaustive consideration of the matter a report was submitted which revealed the purposes of communists and showed the reason of Martens's presence in the United States.

After the Secretary ordered the deportation of Martens, Charles Recht, one of his attorneys, wrote Secretary Wilson and inclosed a communication from the Moscow bolsheviks. Under date of December 29 Mr. Wilson replied. I shall only read part of the letter and ask leave to insert such other parts as I may deem pertinent. I read:

I am glad to know that some one in Russia has at last awakened to a realization of the friendship that has existed between the American people and the Russian people. So far as the American Government and the American people are concerned, that friendship for the Russian people still continues.

In dealing with the question of deportation of aliens the Department of Labor is not concerned with the form of government adopted by or imposed upon the people of Russia, except in so far as our sympathies go out to those who are oppressed.

Let me pause long enough to say that I approve of that expression. We are interested in the governments of all people; it is a friendly interest, one born of our desire to see freedom enjoyed in all lands, but if we had the power we would not interpose it to compel the Russian people to accept our form of government or any form of government. That is for them to determine for themselves. We deplore the tragic conditions prevailing in that unhappy land and regret the temporary subsidence of those strong qualities essential to true progress, and which we know will in the end be revived and asserted to rescue Russia from the chaos and darkness which now engulf her people. The apparent submissiveness of many of the Russian people to the degraded and oppressive rule of communism can be explained and perhaps excused; however, the fate of that mighty people is within their own hands. I have faith in Russia; the long night of her travail will end, and the day will bring liberty and growth to a people who will fill a high place among the world's powers. We can only wait eager to aid Russia and to extend the hand of sympathy and genuine, material relief whenever opportunity affords.

I read further from Secretary Wilson's letter:

In the evidence presented to me in the Martens case it was clearly shown that a group of men, calling themselves communists, had set up a military dictatorship in Russia; that they had camouflaged it under the name of a dictatorship of the proletariat, seeking to convey the impression that it was a dictatorship by the proletariat; that it had by force of arms introduced compulsory labor, in other words, slavery, into Russia.

They have introduced—

Secretary Wilson says—

slavery.

This statement is not an exaggeration. I have here many articles containing statements from bolshevist newspapers, some of them organs of the communist party and its various branches, which conclusively prove that servitude exists in Russia. The workers in the few plants and factories that are operating are held in military bondage. They are compelled to work under the most frightful conditions, and by means of military force. Labor is being militarized and governed as if it were a military unit.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. Before the Senator leaves that portion of the discussion, namely, that pressure is being brought to bear in the name of great bodies of organized labor for recognition of soviet Russia, I wish to call his attention to the fact that at a hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations the other day there were statements to the effect that a large percentage of the membership of these bodies of organized labor were shown to have been aliens, and a collateral investigation shows that a large percentage of the alien membership are of Russian origin. In other words, the Russian aliens in the United States, constituting a large percentage of the membership of these organized bodies, are attempting to bring pressure

upon the American Congress for the recognition of the soviet government in Russia.

Mr. KING. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. FRANCE. I rise merely to correct the impression that might be given by the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire, which I believe to be an erroneous impression. Most of the representatives of the labor organizations were representatives of bodies affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, none of which bodies have any large proportion of foreigners in them. There was, however, one body of organized labor represented there which has a considerable proportion of foreigners in it. That, however, is a body not directly federated with the American Federation of Labor.

I refer to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, some of whom, of course, are Russians; that body, however, not being a part of the American Federation of Labor. I would say, however, of that body of workers that they are most of them loyal Americans who have not as yet had an opportunity of taking out their papers.

The Senator will realize the fact that a great many foreigners come here to enter the clothing trade as tailors, because they were trained in that work in their own country, and that after gaining a competence they work out of that line of endeavor into some other work, becoming merchants or farmers or engaging in some other line of enterprise. It is not because they are unwilling to become American citizens that so many of them are not American citizens. It is because so many in this organization have been here for only a short time.

Mr. KING. The Senator admits, does he not, that there are a large number of Russians, especially Russian Jews, who have come to the United States?

Mr. FRANCE. It is undoubtedly quite true that there are many. I do not know that immigration has been so very great from Russia, however, in late years. I am not able to quote figures, but I wish to call attention to the fact that only one of the organizations referred to was a labor body having any considerable number of foreigners in it.

Mr. MOSES. But, Mr. President, if I may interject, inasmuch as I made the inquiry of the witnesses, I remember very distinctly there were two organizations, one containing 150,000 members, according to the testimony of its spokesman, and the other 200,000. The body containing 150,000 members was said to have about 50 per cent of its membership American citizens and the other was said to have a majority of its members American citizens. Those are the facts according to the record, regardless of any explanation that may be made concerning the reason why those people are not citizens.

In addition to this I may add that another investigation with which I was connected some months ago collateral to the same subject developed the fact that the membership of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers was much more largely alien than the testimony given day before yesterday would indicate.

Mr. FRANCE. If the Senator from Utah will allow me to make an observation apropos of what the Senator from New Hampshire has said—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KING. I yield, if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. FRANCE. Of course, those workers were only interested in the American phase of the question. I think we have drifted into a very unfortunate habit of assuming that every American who advocates any policy with reference to Europe is advocating it because of some particular or personal interest which he has in that portion of Europe involved in the policy. I think that is very unfortunate, because I think we should assume that every man living upon these shores, every man within America, every man who enjoys the benefits of American institutions, will always advocate a policy which will promote the interests of America, and I believe firmly that the members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers who came here to advocate the opening of trade with Russia were animated by patriotic motives and that they were considering only the welfare of the people of the United States and that they were considering the matter of unemployment, which we know is a very grave problem confronting us now. They were discussing the problem entirely from that standpoint. They were not interested in the political phase of the question at all, and practically said so before the committee. They were only considering the problem from the standpoint of American interest.

I think we have a right to assume that every American who advocates a policy with reference to Europe is advocating that policy because he is an American and because it would be a

policy which, in his judgment, mistaken though his judgment may be, would advance American interests. This thing of charging a man with being disloyal because he advocates the opening up of trade with some other country, with being in sympathy with the soviet government because he wants to open up to the great manufacturing enterprises of America the vast markets of Europe, it seems to me is altogether unjust and unjustifiable.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. KING. If the Senator having the bill in charge [Mr. McCUMBER] feels that I shall not lose the floor, I shall be glad to answer the Senator's question, but I do not want to jeopardize my right to continue the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. KING. I yield for a question.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I am willing to make my contribution to the efforts of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to expedite the legislation now before the Senate; but not desiring to go too far afield with the collateral branch of the discussion which has arisen between the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and me, I wish merely to make a further quotation from the testimony taken before the Committee on Foreign Relations on day before yesterday, to the effect that the spokesman for one of the organizations which I have mentioned, the one containing the largest estimated percentage of alien membership—that American citizen stated to the committee that he was in favor of having set up in this country whatever form of government the American workingman wished to establish.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it is manifest that a vigorous propaganda is being waged in this country to compel the United States to recognize the soviet régime. Attempts may be made to camouflage this active movement, and it may be alleged that only trade with Russia is sought, but the fact is that bolshevist agents, here and elsewhere, are by intrigues and bribery attempting to gain recognition for the soviet authority in order that its power may be strengthened and its program of world revolution strengthened. I repeat that there is no trade possible with Russia except through the dictatorship of which Lenin is the head, and that attempts are being made to deceive honest and sympathetic people by pretending that Russia desires trade relations with this Nation as well as with others, and is ready to enter into arrangements which will be mutually satisfactory and advantageous for commercial dealings; but back of it all, and as the paramount purpose, is the recognition of the soviets as a de facto and de jure power, and the multiplication thereby of opportunities for the dissemination of communistic propaganda.

So far as I am concerned, I shall not consent that the bloody hands of Lenin and Trotsky and their adherents shall be held in friendly grasp by the Government of the United States. Others may pursue such course as they please, but the patriotic American people are not in favor of validating, by according recognition to the soviet power, its wicked and cruel acts of spoliation, and accepting it into the sisterhood of nations, whose covenants and treaties and principles of international law and moral precepts would be flouted and treacherously betrayed, and which nations it would plot and intrigue to destroy. The United States refused to acknowledge Huerta and his régime in Mexico because he had been a party to the brutal assassination of Madero and the vice president, Suarez. His crimes were as nothing measured by the mountain of iniquity that has been built by the bolsheviks.

As I have stated heretofore, there are some who entertain the sincere belief that the Government of the United States is preventing trade intercourse between the American people and the Russian people, and that the latter are ready to purchase large quantities of American products. There are others, however, who are followers of Lenin and who desire to see communism established in the United States. They are masquerading under the claim of promoting trade in order that the bolshevik dictatorship may be recognized as a de facto and de jure government. They know that such a course would increase Lenin's power and afford greater opportunities to carry on his scheme for the establishment of a world proletarian dictatorship.

I acquit the Senator from Maryland from any design against our Government or its institutions. His devotion to constitutional government is recognized by all who know him, but I believe his efforts will be regarded by some who are hostile to this Republic as helpful to extreme radicalism and bolshevik triumph; and also that recognition of the soviet power is desired by some Americans.

We might just as well know what this proposition is. This is not an attempt to get trade; it is an attempt to force the President of the United States or Congress to recognize the bolsheviks. Of course, Senators know that it is an Executive function and not a legislative function to determine whether or not recognition shall be accorded a Government. The President receives diplomats and consular representatives from other nations and accredits ambassadors and consular agents to foreign Governments.

Ah, Mr. President, this is an effort on the part of some misguided persons and by some alien enemies of our Government who seek its destruction to secure recognition of the bolshevik government.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. FRANCE. May I ask the Senator if he believes that the British statesmen who have consistently advocated the policy of establishing trade relations between Great Britain and Russia are misguided? They have already formulated a policy and, indeed, a treaty which will enable trade with Russia to be carried on. The question has also been a subject of debate in the House of Commons, and I hold in my hand the record of some of the debates and some of the speeches of British statesmen on the subject. Great Britain having opened up the markets of Russia to British trade—and I might say to British merchants who buy American goods to resell in Russia at a profit to themselves, and at a very great profit to themselves—does the Senator think that the policy of those British statesmen was misguided?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator's question is rather disingenuous. He speaks of trade with Russia, but ignores the question of bolshevik recognition, which must ensue if there are commercial relations of any magnitude between this Republic and Russia, unless the attitude of the bolshevik régime is materially altered. I intended later to refer to the reiterated statements here and elsewhere about Great Britain's trade with Russia, but will briefly discuss it now in view of the Senator's question.

There has been no recognition by Great Britain of the soviet régime. Representatives of the soviet were expelled from Great Britain because of their revolutionary activities after Lloyd-George had admitted them to aid in formulating plans by which trade might possibly be developed in Russia. My opinion is that his attitude was largely influenced by the precarious situation in Persia, India, Egypt, and Asia Minor, as well as in China. The bolshevik régime is actively engaged in revolutionary propaganda in the countries to which I have just referred, and Great Britain's authority in some of its possessions has been greatly weakened by communistic propaganda. Doubtless the British Government has felt the importance of neutralizing, if possible, the bolshevik revolutionary movements within British possessions. Recently a tentative agreement was entered into between Lloyd-George and Krassin, representing the bolsheviks. According to the Associated Press, the London Times denounces the draft and states that it will not make the business community less hostile than it has persistently shown itself toward soviet authority. According to the Associated Press, among the terms of the Russian preliminary agreement which Krassin, the soviet representative, has taken to Moscow for consideration are these:

Each party agrees to refrain from hostile action or propaganda outside its borders against the other's institutions. The soviet particularly agrees to refrain from encouragement of Asiatic people to action against British interests in Asia Minor, Persia, Afghanistan, and India.

No recognition, I assert, has been given the soviet power, but the British Government was constrained because of the imminence of revolution in some of its possessions to submit to an arrangement that would diminish bolshevik propaganda. However, in my opinion, if the proposed agreement shall be ratified by the soviet government, and it has not yet done so, it will not deter the bolshevik from revolutionary movements in the territories just mentioned, and they will violate its terms, as they have violated every agreement and solemn covenant which they have entered into. I predict, however, that the soviet junta will not approve the proposed agreement principally because it prohibits bolshevik propaganda in Great Britain's possessions.

I noticed in this morning's paper a dispatch from London, one statement of which is as follows:

Arrangements by which it is proposed to bring about a resumption of trade relations between Great Britain and Russia are attacked editorially by the Morning Post of this city, which declares the decision regarding this step is a dubious transaction and nothing but a pretense for obtaining recognition of the soviet government.

The Post further states "There is no trade with Russia that is worth consideration," and expresses the opinion that the public is entitled to very explicit account of the Government's policy toward the Russian bolshevik régime. It states any form of recognition of soviet Russia is an immoral thing, and then adds, "Neither France nor the United States believe the soviet government to be a permanent institution."

The Post then asks what Great Britain's position will be if loyal Russians should come into their own.

Mr. President, contrary to the views of the Senator from Maryland, the trade between Great Britain and Russia is inconsequential, and his statements that Great Britain is getting the trade of Russia are not supported, in my opinion, by the facts. Notwithstanding the prolonged negotiations, extending over months, no agreement has been made between Great Britain and the soviet power, and no agreement can be made under Russia's present condition that will bring trade to Great Britain.

The Senator has mentioned the exports of flax. The flax production, as well as that in all industries, has been destroyed. In a report in the January number, entitled "Foreign Affairs—Monthly Review," the statement is made that during the three years of the soviet dictatorship "the flax industry seems to have been destroyed"; and the Russian Cooperation, a soviet organ, in No. 89 for the year 1920, states that the "planting area of flax for 1920 was only 15 or 20 per cent of prewar times. Harvesting likewise has fallen considerably. In 1920 the functionaries of the soviet—there are no others—gathered 1,000,000 pounds, which represents only 6 per cent of the normal harvest."

Later I shall refer to the lack of production and to the misery and famine in Russia.

We need not be frightened, Mr. President, by statements made by the Senator or others that Great Britain is securing Russian trade.

I mentioned that one of the reasons inducing this tentative agreement was the activity of the bolsheviks in Asia. Under date of January 14 there appears in the New York Times the text of an order which was published in the Moscow Pravda, from Tashkent, Russian Turkestan, issued by the bolshevik commander to his troops in Turkestan. The statement in the Pravda is as follows:

Your task is a very responsible one. The soviet republic is sending you to occupy the advanced posts on the frontiers of the friendly countries, Afghanistan and India. The Pamir, at the so-called top of the world, separates revolutionary Russia from the 300,000,000 Indian people who are oppressed by a handful of Englishmen.

On this top of the world you have to raise the red flag of our liberating army. Let the people of India, who are fighting against their British oppressors, know that our friendly help is coming.

Establish communications with the freedom-loving tribes of northern India. Contribute by word and by example to their revolutionary enlightenment. Combat the calumny which the agents of British princes, lords, and bankers are spreading about soviet Russia.

Long live the union of revolutionary peoples of Europe and Asia. Long live the universal liberation of workmen.

The same issue of the Pravda carried the text of a note by Tchitcherine, the soviet foreign affairs representative, to Lord Curzon, British foreign minister, in which the latter was "assured" of the soviets' "friendly feelings for the British Empire."

This is in line with the treachery of the soviet régime. While seeking a trade agreement with Great Britain and "assuring" her of its "friendship" for the British Empire, it is marching its red army and sending its emissaries to overthrow British authority.

Recently a delegation of business men, including Sir Charles Sykes and Sir William Peterson, visited the Baltic Provinces and other countries for the purpose of investigating trade possibilities with the countries visited, as well as Russia. They returned to London on the 17th instant, and the New York Times the following day contained this statement of their report:

Questioned as to Russia, Sir Charles Sykes said that the subject had been carefully gone into and he was bound to say that in his view, trade agreement or no trade agreement, no substantial business was possible from that direction for a long time. A certain amount of trade was taking place to-day, but Russia had practically nothing to offer in exchange for goods, for she had been rendered economically dead by her system of government. He further stated that the bolshevik policy was world revolution, and that of the £12,000,000 to £15,000,000 of bolshevik gold which had been sent abroad, not one-third of it had been used for the purchase of supplies, and those that were purchased were for the equipment of the red army necessary to maintain the communist power. Sir Charles Sykes further stated that the soviet clearing house set up in Copenhagen for the purpose of utilizing bolshevik gold as a credit had broken down because "the bulk of the gold had been utilized for propaganda purposes and because of a lack of commodities in Russia which could be exported." Continuing, he stated "We can not look for trade in that direction and must concentrate on the Baltic Provinces and other parts of eastern Europe where, however bad, conditions may be, they are infinitely more hopeful than in Russia."

Mr. President, this frank statement from the head of the delegation who had investigated the Russian trade problem furnishes convincing proof of the futility of attempting to trade

with Russia as long as she is dominated by the soviets. Contrary to the statement of the Senator from Maryland, England is not engaging in commercial transactions of any importance with the soviets or with the Russian people. Undoubtedly the English manufacturers and business firms would be glad to export their products to Russia if Russia would or could buy them, but bolshevist warfare has reduced Russia to a condition of economic ruin.

These interruptions have diverted me from the letter which I was reading, written by Secretary Wilson. In view of what the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from New Hampshire have stated regarding the supporters of the Senator's resolution, I would like to add that if there are representatives of the American Federation of Labor supporting the soviet dictatorship, they are giving aid and comfort to their most inveterate enemy. No organization has been more bitterly assailed by Lenin and his communistic adherents than has the Federation of Labor, and indeed all organizations based upon trade-unionism. He has also attacked the Socialists and attempted to crush their organizations, not only in Russia, but in every country. It has been a part of the plan of the communists to destroy organized labor and the Socialist Parties, because the former—that is, trade-unionism—believes in law and order, a recognition of capital, and the right of a majority to establish a government of their own choice. Socialists are opposed because they refuse to follow the revolutionary and destructive policies of bolshevism and to support a communistic dictatorship which aims at world dominion.

The third internationale, called by Lenin, announces the creed of the bolsheviks, and this creed declares an unrelenting war upon all nations and all political and labor organizations. Members of the American Federation of Labor should know that their implacable and deadly foe is not capital, but communism. This destructive, disorganizing, and despotic dictatorship is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith and every usage and convention underlying the whole structure of international law; the negation, in short, of every principle upon which it is possible to base harmonious or truthful relations, whether of nations or individuals.

Communism is opposed to those progressive and civilizing forces upon which society rests and under whose operation civilization has been developed. Communism is a brutal, materialistic, revolutionary force. It seeks the destruction of law and order and government and the overthrow of every foundation upon which society rests. It is the enemy of the church, the foe of religion, the blasphemer of God, and the enemy of everything which stands for sweetness and purity and virtue and righteousness in the lives and activities of men. No more brutal, sensual, corrupt, or monstrous system has ever been projected under which human beings were to exist than that which the soviet dictatorship is attempting to rivet upon the people of Russia and to fasten upon the world. I do not believe that any members of the Federation of Labor countenance bolshevism or desire that the United States shall extend its hand to accept the bloody grasp of the Russian communists.

The able leader of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Samuel Gompers, has been the object of the most wanton and bitter assaults from the Russian communists. The followers of the third internationale who are in the United States have been equally virulent in their attacks upon Mr. Gompers. The communists realize that Mr. Gompers stands for law and order and the rule of the majority. They know that he believes in the Constitution of the United States and has eloquently pleaded for the maintenance of this Republic and for the extension of democratic principles throughout all lands. The communists realize that the principles of the American Federation of Labor are the antithesis of the communistic creed.

May I add, Mr. President, the American people appreciate their form of government and realize that this Republic provides the safest and wisest plan ever devised for the political and industrial freedom of the people? American labor will not be deceived by bolshevism and it will not seek a partnership with the communistic régime.

Let me return to the letter of Secretary Wilson:

Naturally, the sympathy of the administration and of the American people, including the workers, goes out to the Russian people under such circumstances, just as our sympathies go out to the oppressed of all lands no matter who or what the oppressor may be. But these things did not bring Martens within the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor. The evidence was cumulative and conclusive that the military dictatorship of Russia, calling itself the soviet government, was appropriating large sums of money to stir up insurrection by force of arms against the United States Government.

I want the full significance of this statement to be understood by Senators and the American people. Martens and the soviet dictatorship of Russia were even "appropriating large sums of money to stir up insurrection by force of arms against

the United States." Secretary Wilson can not be charged with prejudice against labor or labor organizations or liberal political or economic movements. He stands at the head of one of the executive arms of the Government and has full opportunity to ascertain what industrial or political movements are abroad in the land. His department is charged with enforcing the emigration laws, and he thus becomes acquainted with aliens among us and their activities, industrially or in groups. We thus have a high official of the Government charging, after full investigation, that the bolsheviks of Russia have plotted for the destruction of the United States.

It is a novel principle in international law, and one that is not likely to be generally accepted, that a newly established military dictatorship in one country may capitalize the traditional friendship of another country for its people by making a pretense of wanting to establish friendly relations with the Government at the same time that it is seeking to destroy it by stirring up insurrection.

I wish I had time to read from the scores of documents which I have here containing statements of Lenin and Trotsky and Litvinoff and Krassin and other communists, in which they declare it to be the purpose of the soviet dictatorship to produce a world revolution, and to destroy not only our Government but all other Governments; and while they are making these statements and sending their spies and agents into our midst to carry out their designs by the corrupt use of money and by every possible means some of our misguided friends in the United States are appealing to us to accord these enemies and the soviet dictatorship, which they control, full recognition, and treat with them and their representatives as we would with honorable nations and upright statesmen, to whom international law is sacred, and whose promises and treaties are observed.

I am not willing to take that step and to deal with a dictatorship which rests upon tyranny, bloodshed, and brutality, and which is plotting the overthrow of my country and the social structure existing in the world. The military dictatorship of Lenin and Trotsky rests upon the murdered forms of thousands of Russia's sons and daughters and feeds upon the blood and woes of crushed and helpless men and women. It is doubtful whether history records a more cowardly, cruel, and despotic power than that which exists in Russia to-day under the name of soviet government.

Secretary Wilson continues:

As long as that attitude is maintained by any group in Russia, whether it temporarily dominates that country by force of arms or not, members of its organization residents in but alien to the United States will be subject to the deportation laws administered by the Department of Labor.

Our Government is a people's Government. Its basic law can be changed whenever the people desire it to be changed by peaceful parliamentary processes. Yet this is the Government that the soviet group in Russia seek to overthrow through the fighting force of an aggressive minority which they hope to pit against a passive majority.

But having established a Government with universal suffrage, and consequently the most perfect democracy on earth, we will not permit a military despotism in Russia, imposed upon a people but recently relieved from bondage, to stir up insurrection amongst our alien residents to whom we have extended hospitality and opened the doors of hope, even though their efforts in that direction are so futile that they cause us but slight annoyance.

The insulting intimation that profitable trade with Russia is so important in the American mind that we would permit our own institutions to be undermined and destroyed and our liberties submerged if we can but have access to that trade only reflects the brutal materialistic conceptions of the dominant group in Russia. We have given several illustrations to the world, among them our entrance into the recent war, that while we love comfort we hate oppression and have a passion for human liberty.

For these reasons Congress has directed that every alien who is a member of an organization that proposes to use force to overthrow the United States shall be expelled. The traditional friendship between the American and Russian peoples will continue, and when a government exists in Russia that seeks to work out Russian destiny in the Russian way and leaves us to work out our destiny in our way there will be no desire on the part of the American Government to deport its officers and members as such.

Mr. President, this letter deserves extended comment, but time forbids. I express the hope that it will be widely read by the American people.

Mr. President, I have received a communication from a labor organization which is printed, and shows upon its face that it is one of a series of printed documents sent out to the Federation of Labor or to other organizations as part of the plan of propaganda so well conceived and executed to secure recognition for the soviets. It is not the spontaneous expression of those who sign, but a printed document sent to these organizations by some one interested in securing the recognition of the soviet government; and this document which has been sent to me states that—

We demand that the State Department take immediate steps to remove all obstacles to trade with Russia.

Mr. President, see how the people are misled! There are no obstacles to trading with Russia. The men who signed this, the Senator from Maryland, any American to-day, may ship his products, if he has any, to Russia, and if he can find anybody

there that will buy them, and if he is willing to take in return what they may have to pay him with, the barter or the exchange or the sale may take place. There are no restrictions, as I stated a moment ago to the Senator from Maryland, except in regard to munitions of war.

The demand is to restore the right to travel between the United States and soviet Russia. The only restriction of the right to travel is found in Russia. The United States interposes absolutely no obstacle to the freest entrance into Russia. Any person desiring to go to Russia can go, so far as this Government is concerned. The facts before us, though, would seem to indicate that any person going to Russia would be fortunate if he got out alive. Berkman and Emma Goldman are there, and they would be glad to return to America. Why do not some of the men who want to go to Russia go there? I am sure America would be glad to get rid of them. There will be no obstacles interposed here. Whatever obstacles they encounter will be encountered in soviet Russia.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. FRANCE. Does the Senator contend that no obstacles have been placed in the way of citizens of America desiring to go to Russia seeking Russian trade? Is he not aware that it is very difficult for an American citizen to secure a passport to go to Russia for business purposes?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, that leads to the consideration of a matter somewhat foreign to the discussion.

But I will reply. What is a passport? It is a piece of paste-board or beautifully engraved paper which, in effect, introduces the holder to a Government. The Senator could not get a passport to bolshevik Russia, because of the absence of any treaty between the United States and the Lenin junta, and because there are no diplomatic or other relations between this country and the bolshevik authority. Any American citizen can obtain a passport to Finland, or France, or Norway, or Sweden, or Denmark. We have acknowledged Czechoslovakia and the Jugo-Slav nation, and passports are given to those nations. If the Senator complains because there is no letter of introduction to Lenin and Trotski, he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, does not the Senator think that he is giving an entirely new definition to a passport? Of course, I am not prepared to trace the form of a passport, but a passport is simply a statement by this Government in effect that "This man is an American citizen; let him pass; take notice that he is an American citizen; take notice that the American Government is back of him, to protect him, to aid him, and to defend his rights wherever he may go in the world; take notice that he shall be allowed to pass, and that he shall be given the protection due an American citizen." It is not a letter of introduction. It is a passport allowing him to go, and a statement that he is entitled to the protection of this Government wherever he does go.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. I am constrained to say that both the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Maryland are wrong in their statements as to what a passport is. It is not a letter of introduction to any individual or Government and it does not purport to allow a man to go anywhere. A passport is merely an identification card, a certificate that the bearer is a citizen of the United States. It does not permit him to go into Russia; it does not permit him to go into England—if the Russian Government or the English Government does not want him there. Before he can go into Russia or into Denmark or into Sweden or any place else the passport would have to be viséed by a representative of that Government in order to allow him to pass.

There is a great deal of popular misunderstanding about passports. We hear about our passports being violated. There is no violation of a passport. There may be a violation of a treaty right which gives our citizens the right to travel in certain countries, if they do not visé the passports and allow our citizens to go. But, to repeat what I started out to say, a passport is a mere identification card, certifying that the bearer is a United States citizen.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I will say that I am glad that I find myself in agreement with the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I must have conveyed a false impression if I gave the impression that a passport did give an American citizen authority to go to any country.

Mr. KNOX. That was the language the Senator from Maryland used, as I understood him.

Mr. FRANCE. But it serves notice that he is an American citizen, and he is entitled to all the rights of an American

citizen, and to the protection with which this Government surrounds its citizens, and it gives notice that he is entitled to all rights which are guaranteed by the various treaties, and that any country disregarding that identification card, if it may be so called—and that is in substance what it is—will be liable for any mistreatment of that citizen. Is not that the idea involved?

Mr. KNOX. Only by implication; not any more so than if he would go without a passport and make his identity known. If his rights were being violated by the officials of any country knowingly, knowing that he was a citizen of the United States, the country violating his rights would take upon themselves just as much peril as if he carried a passport. But there is nothing on the face of the passport which carries, either by language, or in any other way, except by implication, what the Senator from Maryland has just stated.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, perhaps my statement concerning the nature of the effect of a passport was a little inaccurate, but yet it is substantially what is said by the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Norman H. Davis, in his letter to Judge Parker. The form of the passport has been changed slightly since the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania occupied the position of Secretary of State. My understanding is that at that time there was no country named in the passport. At the present time the form is substantially this:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA PASSPORT.
Department of State.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, the undersigned, Secretary of State of the United States of America, hereby request all to whom it may concern, to permit the name of the person to whom the passport is issued, a citizen of the United States, safely and freely to pass, and in case of need to give him (or her) all lawful aid and protection.

This passport is valid for use only in the following countries herein specified, unless amended. (Here follow the names of certain countries.)

[L. S.]

Secretary of State.

This form has been employed for several years, and passports now contain the names of one or more countries. If a person desires to visit Sweden, his passport will contain the names of Sweden and a number of other countries in that part of Europe; but none of the passports issued contain the name of Russia or countries with which we sustain no diplomatic relations. In the sense that a country is named in the passport, it bears some analogy to a letter of introduction to that country. The passport, as such, gives no right of entrance of the holder into any country. Those Americans who are now visiting Europe after obtaining passports must have them viséed by representatives of those countries to which they expect to go. Any person, with or without a passport, may present himself at any Russian port or at the boundary line of Russia and seek admission to Russia for trade or for any other purpose. Whether he is permitted to enter Russia will depend upon the Russian people. A passport under the seal of the United States would not move the soviet authorities or induce them to admit the bearer. Perhaps the possession of the passport might be an impediment to his obtaining permission to enter Russia. The bolsheviks have no treaty with the United States; but if they did have, there is no reason to believe that its terms would be respected. So passports would not facilitate trade or give the possessors of them any advantages in Russia.

We know that a number of Americans have gone to Russia. Some doubtless carried passports and some did not. Russia admits whom she pleases. There are Americans now in the Scandinavian Republics and the Baltic Provinces who, if they carried bundles of passports, would be accorded no different reception at the hands of the soviets than if they had none. If passports are required to enter Russia, then Americans to whom I have referred and who are now in Europe have their passports, and they are in the same form, with the exception that the word "Russia" is not printed with the names of the other countries, as if the dictatorship of Lenin had been recognized and the holders were seeking entrance into Russia.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator will permit me to observe that it must be borne in mind that we denounced our treaties with Russia during the reign of the imperial Czar. Since that there has been no treaty, and the only protection Americans have had in Russia was that which they would have under the general principles of international law and not under any treaty rights.

Mr. KING. Following the establishment of the provisional government under Kerensky our Government continued its diplomatic relations with Russia. Gov. Francis, of Missouri, was the American ambassador, and he represented the United States

in its intercourse with the provisional government, and Mr. Bakneteff was appointed, as I recall, Russian ambassador to the United States by the Kerensky government. Later, when the bolsheviks obtained control of Petrograd and Moscow, it became necessary for our ambassador to leave Russia. The attitude of the bolsheviks was so menacing that not only the American ambassador but consular agents were compelled to flee.

I repeat, if there are any Americans who desire to export commodities to Russia they will encounter no restrictions from our Government, and these persistent efforts to mislead the people and to deceive them as to the attitude of our Government concerning trade are reprehensible in the highest degree.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator right here what Russia is producing to-day that we could trade for?

Mr. KING. Nothing.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have heard a great deal about the right to trade with Russia, but I have not heard of one thing Russia has produced since the war which she can export to any country. I had occasion the other day to talk with an individual whose home is in one of the countries bordering on Russia, who is well acquainted with all of Russia, and he informed me that that country had gone back practically into a state of barbarity; that each family was trying to produce just what was necessary to eat and to wear and make it possible to exist; that if they raised any more than that the soldiers took it; that the soldiers had no means of living except as they lived off the people of the country through which they were marching; that they had no commissary department, and the soldiers would have to seize what they could get hold of; that these people were producing nothing; that they could be organized into no kind of society, but lived almost the same as the bushmen of Africa. There may be a time when Russia will produce again, but I do not think any country need bother itself very much about Russian trade at the present time.

Mr. KING. The Senator from North Dakota has graphically stated Russia's industrial situation as it exists to-day. The cities and towns are losing their population, and the starving and suffering people are endeavoring to obtain enough from the soil to preserve life. Industry is dead and production of commodities for export is at an end, as long as the present system prevails.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, if the Senators care to have me do so, I make the statement that both the Senators are entirely misinformed as to the facts. The gentleman with whom the Senator from North Dakota has talked was either misinformed as to the facts or he had some reason for not fully stating the facts. Russia has enormous reserves of materials for export to-day. Great quantities of furs, for example, have accumulated in Russia, which are worth many, many millions of dollars. Russia is to-day exporting to Great Britain large quantities of manganese ore, Russia before the war having supplied, I believe, about 75 per cent of all the manganese ore of the world. She has large stores of platinum ready to turn into the markets of the world. She has great stores of hemp and flax, of which the nations stand very greatly in need, this country in particular. There are large stores of many other materials in Russia, not manufactured, however, I will admit. There is a great dearth of manufactured articles; but there have been great supplies of raw materials in Russia which might be exported if the railways were so rehabilitated that they could carry them.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am afraid those vast stores would go up in vapor the minute we should really investigate them, the same as some of the vast German stores that were supposed to flood the whole world have been found to be nonexistent. I know they have no means of transportation in Russia to-day, that the railroads are practically tied up, that they are not functioning, and, as I suggested, I am certain the political position of my informant was such that he could give me a pretty fair view of the situation and that he was accurate in his statement.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Following the trend of some of the observations which have been made since the emergency tariff bill has been taken up for consideration, I have rather reached the conclusion that at least a portion of the Senators were not interested in imports coming into this country, that they were not much concerned about them, that on the other hand they were deeply concerned in keeping out the importations. If Russia has nothing to import to this country I do not see why Senators who entertain those views ought to be concerned. The question that I think is important from their standpoint is one

that I wish now to propound to the Senator from Maryland, who seems to have given great study to the question.

I have been under the impression that this country was very much interested in its export trade. I have been under the impression that now or in normal times the prosperity of the country and the development and expansion of its industries were dependent very largely upon our export trade. Whether Russia has any imports they want to send to us and that some Senators want to keep out or not from their standpoint is not material, but from my standpoint it is material to find out the opportunity which offers for the purchase of our goods. I should like to ask the Senator if he can give the Senate any information as to Russia's ability to absorb our exportable products.

Mr. FRANCE. I shall be glad to give the Senator the information, with permission of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Maryland if I do not lose the floor. I hope, however, that the Senator will not consume too much time.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator from Utah will allow the Senator from Maryland to have enough time to indicate to the Senate what Russia's abilities are in this direction, because I think it very important as bearing upon the question whether it is desirable to have trade relations with Russia.

Mr. FRANCE. As soon as I am able to arrange the vast amount of material on hand I expect to discuss the question at some length, at not too great length, however, but at sufficient length to indicate particularly to some of the Senators from Southern States the need in Russia for cotton, for example, and the ability of Russia to pay for that cotton which she does need.

I will say this, and it is in reply to an observation made a short time ago by the Senator from Utah to the effect that nothing stood in the way of the trade going on between this country and Russia. I would say that what stands in the way of that trade going on now is the refusal of our mint to mint the Russian gold, which could be brought to this country in payment for articles which they desire to export from this country to Russia.

If the Senator will permit me, I will give a very definite example of a transaction which took place a very short time ago. This was a very small order which a certain agent, representing certain Russian interests, wished to place here, an order of only \$400,000. In payment for \$400,000 worth of goods this gentleman representing Russian interests—and it is immaterial who those interests were—offered to make payment in gold, the gold being in the shape of gold bars. The representative of the manufacturing firm having the goods for sale at first hesitated to accept the gold bars. He inquired at the mint whether the gold bars would be minted and was informed that they could not be minted. However, desiring very greatly to put through the transaction, he interviewed certain manufacturing firms which manufactured jewelry and finally succeeded in selling to those manufacturers of jewelry the \$400,000 worth of gold bars, and it was thus possible to put through the transaction.

I was made aware yesterday of a transaction which negatives the views which several of the Senators seem to entertain that no transactions can go on with private citizens of Russia, a view which can not be maintained when the facts are carefully examined into. There came to my knowledge only on yesterday these facts, facts which I wished to have presented to the Foreign Relations Committee, but which I did not have opportunity to present to that committee on the day of the hearing.

A gentleman representing very responsible firms in the United States has entered into a contract, of which contract I myself have seen a copy, not with the soviets but with the Central Co-operative Union of Russia, for the sale to that union of goods, principally tools and agricultural implements and machinery, this order amounting to \$6,000,000, for which he can have laid down in New York \$6,000,000 worth of gold. However, he will be unable to have that gold, as laid down in New York, minted at the mint, so that the transaction is held up.

This is not a transaction with the soviet government. It is a contract with the Central Co-operative Union of Russia. Of course, Senators are aware of what that central cooperative society is. It is a great cooperative organization which has been in existence for many years. Perhaps some 15 years ago it became a strong organization. It is a cooperative buying and a cooperative selling organization. It runs cooperative factories and it has cooperative stores. The assets of this cooperative society amount, I believe, to something like \$200,000,000. It has gold, which it has accumulated as a reserve, and with this gold it is willing, as I say, to buy \$6,000,000 worth of American goods. But the American mint, of course, refuses to mint any gold which may be suspected of being of Russian origin.

I believe the statute—I can not refer to the statute at the moment, because I have not the reference in my mind—

Mr. KING. I have it here and I shall be glad to present what I believe the facts to be concerning Russian gold supply, although it is outside of my present discussion.

Mr. FRANCE. I shall be glad to have the Senator refer to the statute, but I think in substance the statute with reference to the mining of gold provides that any owner of gold may take that gold to the United States mint and for a certain fee may have it minted, of course presumption of ownership going with possession; that is to say, it is presumed that the possessor of the gold is the owner of the gold. I believe the mint has no machinery for looking into the title of gold which is brought to it to be minted. It would of course require most elaborate machinery if the mint was to look into the title to all gold brought to it, as I indicated the other day. A miner from California or from Arizona or from Alaska comes to the mint, for example, with a chamois bag full of gold. Under the old practice the mint would take that gold, assay it, and mint it without attempting to search the title to the gold, assuming that it belongs to the man who brings it. If the mint, however, presumes that the gold is stolen and if it must be assured of the title of that gold before it mints it, of course then it would be necessary for it to trace the origin of the gold. It would have to inquire how that man came into possession of it, how the previous owner came into possession of it, how that man came into the possession of the mine from which it was mined, and how the man preceding him came into possession of it, and it would indeed be necessary for the mint to search the title of that gold exactly as a title company searches the title to land, a procedure which is manifestly impossible.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Maryland a question for my own information, with the permission of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Suppose it is practically publicly known that a number of bandits have broken into a storehouse where gold has been kept in bars and stolen that gold, and they bring the gold to be minted. The Treasury Department has the information that it has been stolen. Is there any duty incumbent upon the Treasury Department to mint that gold which it believes to have been stolen and to turn the minted product over to the thieves?

Mr. FRANCE. That is all a matter of assumption. Of course, if the operator of the mint can assume that the gold has been stolen and can refuse to mint it on that ground, how could he mint it?

Mr. McCUMBER. In a case where they believe it has been stolen, is there any discretion on the part of the Treasury Department in reference to the minting of the product?

Mr. FRANCE. Of course, this is a very interesting and important question. I personally do not see how the officials of the mint can have it within their power to question the title to the gold unless they have at their command the machinery for searching the title to the gold which is brought to them, because it would manifestly be unjust for the official of the mint to say to this man, "we can not mint your gold because it may be stolen," and to another man, "we will mint your gold."

Mr. McCUMBER. But that is hardly the question. Where the evidence is quite clear to them and the presumption is strong that it has been stolen, then the question is whether the Treasury Department is compelled to close its eyes to what it believes to be the truth and to mint the product and turn it over to the person who presents it.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Maryland has answered to his satisfaction the question propounded by the Senator from North Dakota, I should like to continue my remarks, as time is precious and I wish to get through.

Mr. McCUMBER. I shall not interrupt the Senator again.

Mr. FRANCE. If the Senator from Utah will allow me to reply to the Senator from North Dakota, I would say that, so far as his question is concerned, I fail to see how it has any bearing on the subject, because the gold to which I refer has not been stolen and no one has ever said that it had been stolen. It merely is of Russian origin and belongs to the Russian Central Cooperative Society. It probably is gold which was earned by the peasants and stored in their stockings until the time arrived when they wished to turn it over to the cooperative buying society to buy what they needed.

Mr. KING. I will say to the Senator that if he will bring to the mint any gold of the character that he has last described, of cooperative origin or owned by individuals, there will be no obstacle to its being minted; but if it is of soviet origin, or suspected of being of soviet origin, then the Government will not mint or purchase it.

Mr. FRANCE. I have evidently not made myself clear. I have been attempting to tell about a transaction where gold of that very character has been refused at the mint because I meant to say this: The actual gold was not brought here, but the proposition was laid before the officials of the mint, and they said that they could not mint it inasmuch as it was Russian gold.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have been diverted from the topic I was discussing, but I shall refer to the gold situation, because the Senator from Maryland has brought it into the discussion. In the first place, the amount of gold in Russia does not aggregate what the Senator has contended. The entire amount of gold in Russia to-day—I am speaking of that under the control of the soviets—does not exceed \$300,000,000.

I will show the Senator from Maryland just what the Russian Government did have, and the probable amount now controlled by the soviet junta.

Mr. FRANCE. The amount has been drawn down; and I think it is safe to say that the amount of gold now available in Russia does not exceed \$500,000,000; that is, gold in the treasury, not taking into consideration the gold which is in private ownership.

Mr. KING. Just one word before coming to the gold situation.

The Senator from Maryland has referred to cooperative societies in Russia. He knows that under the old Czaristic régime cooperative societies were established in Russia, but they have been either entirely suppressed or reduced to impotency by the soviets. Where they do exist they are under the surveillance and direction of the soviets, so that it is practically impossible for any trade relations to exist between them and other nations.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. FRANCE. I should like to add that the date of the contract to which I have referred was subsequent to the date which has been considered to be the date upon which the soviet government refused to allow the cooperative societies further to deal on their own account; in other words, the contract was made by the cooperative societies at a date subsequent to that after which, it was said, the cooperative societies would be forbidden to make any contracts.

Mr. KING. I intended, when discussing the industrial condition of Russia, to refer to the cooperative societies mentioned by the Senator. However, in view of what the Senator has said, I shall briefly refer to the subject at this point. I think the Senator will discover, upon investigation, that his information is inaccurate as to the present existence of Russian cooperative societies. Prior to the war, and, indeed, up to the time when the bolsheviks entered upon the destruction of order and government in Russia, these cooperative societies constituted an important part of the economic life of the nation. I have here many references, some from communist newspapers, showing the suppression of these organizations by the bolsheviks. Efforts were made by these societies to continue their constructive and vital work after Lenin's dictatorship was established; the latter saw in these associations a menace to communism, and so they were suppressed. It is quite likely that in some parts of Russia, in which bolshevik troops and bolshevik commissars are not found, some of these societies still exist, and are still functioning, although in a feeble manner. I shall not take the time of the Senate to place before them, or in the Record, the incontrovertible evidence of the destruction of these societies by the soviet government, but will offer one piece of strong evidence.

Mr. Spargo in his admirable article found in the New York Times, under date of December 12, 1920, accurately states the facts regarding these societies, and his statement is so complete that I desire to submit it to the Senate:

The most amazing feature of these articles by Mr. Wells is the manner in which he ignores the biggest fact in the economic life of Russia, and the fact of greatest political importance. Beyond a mere casual reference, he does not deal with the great Russian cooperative movement, notwithstanding its profound importance and its vital relation to the present and future organization of the economic life of Russia. The bolsheviks found a vast network of local cooperative societies, more than 35,000 in number and embracing over 12,000,000 members. Having regard to the fact that most of these members were heads of families, it is safe to say that these organizations represented close upon 60,000,000 persons; that is to say, considerably more than one-third of the total population of the country. Even granting the communist theory, it is quite obvious that such a network of cooperatives must be of the greatest possible value as the nucleus of economic organization competent to carry the nation through a very critical period and directly enlisting the activities of millions of people. It is a well-known fact that during the eight months prior to the bolshevik counter revolution the cooperatives admirably served this purpose.

One of the worst crimes of which the bolsheviks have been guilty, and for which no condemnation can be too severe, is their ruthless sup-

pression of these voluntary and autonomous organizations of the people and the consequent wrecking of the most important available instrumentality for maintaining the life of the Russian people and averting famine and disaster. It is not a little strange that H. G. Wells so completely ignored one of the biggest factors responsible for the present deplorable situation in soviet Russia. Incidentally, I may be pardoned, perhaps, if I call attention to the fact that the overwhelming majority of these cooperatives were composed of and organized and maintained by peasants.

The reason is apparent for the bolshevist suppression of these organizations. They were formed by the agriculturists of Russia and were based upon the theory of private property. Their existence was a menace to Lenin's despotism; hence the destructive war waged against them. The Senator states that only yesterday he learned that the Central Cooperative Society of Russia was desirous of purchasing agricultural implements in the United States and was ready to pay therefor \$3,000,000 in gold. I of course am not familiar with the facts in regard to this matter, but I feel certain that when the facts are ascertained an entirely different situation will be revealed from that which the Senator understands to exist. He will find, I have no doubt, that this proposed transaction is a part of the bolshevist propaganda. I have read of similar instances occurring in European nations; one or more individuals would approach business men in Norway or Sweden or other European countries, and state that they were the agents of some Russian association which desired to purchase commodities and were prepared to pay for the same in gold. In most instances investigation disclosed that the persons had no gold, and where the transaction was consummated it was discovered that those who represented the purchasers were agents of the bolshevik government. Wherever gold was paid for products sent to Russia, it was found to be gold of bolshevik origin. The Senator will find that a functioning, active, and independent Central Cooperative Society is a myth, or, if such an organization exists, it is on paper or is perpetuated by the communist government to be used as an instrumentality to further the schemes of the bolshevik. Mr. Martens, when in the United States, pursued the same course that bolshevist representatives have in every country where they have been permitted entrance. It was their plan to inflame the people with the idea that the soviet dictatorship was ready to buy millions, indeed billions, of dollars' worth of commodities, for which payment would immediately be made in gold. But in some European countries where the bolshevik gold would have been received in exchange for products, the transactions were seldom completed, and in the few completed transactions the amount involved was unimportant, the reason being undoubtedly that the gold supply of the bolsheviks is so limited that they are unable to make liberal purchases even of articles imperatively needed by the communist government.

Mr. President, so many interruptions have occurred which compelled digressions and a departure from a logical discussion of the Russian questions that my remarks will appear rather disconnected and matters relating to the same subject will be referred to at different times, and, of course, more or less of repetition will be inevitable.

It was my intention to consider the question of the Russian gold supply at a later period in my remarks and after I had shown the exhausted condition of Russia and her lack of resources, as a result of which no considerable trade, even if the bolshevik régime did not prevent it, would be possible. However, in view of the Senator's reference to the gold supply, I shall now bring that matter to the attention of the Senate. It is persistently claimed by those who are endeavoring to secure recognition for the communistic dictatorship that the United States is losing a great amount of trade with Russia and that other nations, particularly Great Britain, are engaged in extensive commercial transactions with the soviet dictatorship or the Russian people. It is also contended that the bolshevik government has enormous quantities of gold, and that if it were not for the action of the Government of the United States hundreds of millions of dollars of gold would be exported to the United States in payment for our commodities.

We frequently hear the statement made that the soviets have from eight hundred millions to one billion dollars in gold. Some American business men have been deceived by these claims and are misled as to the possibility of extensive trading relations between the United States and Russia. I am in receipt of a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, written two or three days ago, in which he states:

It is estimated that the amount of gold in Russia does not now exceed \$150,000,000, not including about \$200,000,000 reported to have been confiscated from Rumania.

Senators are aware of the fact that the Treasury Department and its agencies collate data showing the quantity of gold in the world. The available supply of gold in each country for monetary purposes and for use in the arts is pretty accurately known,

and the statistics gathered by various nations as to the world's supply of gold and silver have pretty generally agreed.

The Secretary refers to the Rumanian gold. After the entrance of Rumania into the war, she sent for safe-keeping to Russia her gold supply, variously estimated from one hundred and twenty-five to two hundred millions of dollars. There is no question in regard to this transaction. When the Czar was overthrown the Rumanian gold was in the Russian treasury, and when the provisional government organized by Kerenski was overthrown the bolsheviks seized the Russian treasury and took possession of the Rumanian gold.

In addition, France had 50,000,000 francs in gold with the Russian Government, which was also taken by Lenin. Rumania has not received her gold, and it is still in the possession of the bolshevik. The representative of Rumania gave notice to the Allies at the San Remo conference, as well as at various economic councils held under the League of Nations, that her gold supply had not been returned and that she would hold other nations to an accounting if they accepted any gold from the bolshevik dictatorship. It has been stolen by the bolsheviks, and of course they have no title to the same, and no civilized nation would accept from the bolsheviks this stolen gold in payment for commodities or for any other purpose.

France likewise has laid claim to her gold supply seized by the bolsheviks, and has notified Great Britain and all other nations that the bolsheviks have no title to the same and have no right to dispose of it.

For the purpose of showing Russia's gold supply, I read from the Commerce Reports issued by the Department of Commerce under date of August, 1920. There appears a statement from the American consul general, W. Stanley Hollis, who is stationed in London, a portion of which is as follows:

WORLD'S STOCK OF GOLD.

The following article, compiled by a financial correspondent of the London Times, shows the gold holdings of the world's State banks and treasuries at the close of certain of the past seven years, and also on June 30 last, and therefore gives a measure of the movement of gold money during the war. In this is included one doubtful item—that of the Imperial Bank of Russia, for which no figure later than that of October, 1917 (\$129,500,000) is available, and the totals shown since that date are approximations, much open to question. The last two figures of \$65,000,000 are based on the statement that the gold reserve transferred to Omsk amounted on August 1, 1919, to 651,522,118 rubles.

From this statement it appears that the Russian gold supply in October, 1917, was approximately \$600,000,000, and that on August 1, 1919, it amounted to \$65,000,000, or slightly over \$300,000,000. That amount includes, as I am advised, the Rumanian gold. Deduct from the total the Rumanian and French gold and the remainder would be from \$100,000,000 to \$150,000,000. Of course, what amount has been expended since then or what amount has been utilized for propaganda purposes it is impossible to determine. So that in assuming the existence of the above amount all doubts are resolved against the contention that the bolsheviks possess an extensive gold supply.

Mr. Hollis further states:

On the basis of the latest figures obtainable, the Times correspondent computes the gold holdings of the State banks and treasuries of the countries named at the close of 1912, 1914, 1915, 1918, 1919, and on June 20, 1920, to have been:

RUSSIA.	
December, 1913.....	\$151,000,000
December, 1914.....	155,400,000
December, 1915.....	161,200,000
December, 1918.....	80,000,000
December, 1919.....	65,000,000
June 20, 1920.....	65,000,000

Mr. Hollis presents a table showing the gold holdings in the various countries for the years mentioned, but I have given only the figures with respect to Russia. Following this statement Mr. Hollis refers to the loss in the gold holdings in several countries, including Russia, in 1919. As I interpret these figures, there were only \$65,000,000, or approximately \$225,000,000, in all of the Russian banks, including the gold held by the bolsheviks, on June 20, 1920. It is known that since that time there has been a shrinkage in the volume of gold controlled by the soviet dictatorship.

I next call attention to the article appearing in the Journal of Commerce, of New York, under date of November 17, 1920, which is as follows:

RUSSIAN RESERVE WIDELY SCATTERED—KOLCHAK SUPPOSED TO HAVE USED IT—SOVIET ORGAN CLAIMS TO STATE OBJECTS—AMOUNTS SENT TO VLADIVOSTOK—HOW GOLD WAS SHIPPED TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The last issue of the Ekonomicheskaja Shissn, the economic organ published by the Russian soviet government, contains a detailed account of what happened to the Russian gold reserve since it was captured by Admiral Kolchak and his adherents at Kazan in 1918. The article says:

"In order to provide a more secure place for the treasure it was first taken to Samara and afterwards to Omsk. A large part—1,230 boxes with gold bars—were, beginning March 10, 1919, transferred to Vladivostok and used by Kolchak in his financial transactions with the Entente. Vladivostok was the center of these operations. Later, in

August and September, 1919, minted gold and metal in bars to the value of 197,021,672 rubles followed the first lot.

Another lot, bars worth 10,557,744 rubles and 33,000 rubles coin, was started to Vladivostok in October, 1919; but it never reached there, as the Cossack Ataman (chief) Saemjenow held it up at Tschita and used it for his own purposes. The gold transferred to Vladivostok was used in foreign exchange operations by the credit department of the Government, as the minister of finance had directed. The exact amount so used is not known, but from reliable authority it is learned that up to October, 1919, 1,377 pud—pure gold, 31,515,000 gold in coin, \$1,000,000, and 2,720,000 pesetas were disbursed.

ACCOUNTS LACKING.

No account has ever been rendered as to the disposition of these huge sums. The State bank in Omsk reports, however, that the following sums were removed from Kazan and Samara (the coin taken at its nominal value, the unminted gold at 5 rubles and 50 kopeks for the solonitk): Russian coin, 514,820,743 rubles; foreign coin, 40,577,830; bars, 95,078,493; blocks, 529,594, and grains, 525,477 rubles; in all, 651,532,117 rubles, or 30,563 pud. Of this quantity 9,043 pud arrived safely in Vladivostok, 2,000 were taken by Saemjenow, and 19,520 pud were en route when the bolsheviks took them. According to declarations made by the former assistant to the last financial minister of the Tsar, W. T. Nowitzki, the Russian gold reserve was, in the year 1914, larger than that of any other country in the world, aggregating in round figures \$150,000,000. This sum decreased during the first year of the war in such a manner that only \$32,000,000 remained, \$68,000,000 having been sent to England and America, partly for war supplies and partly for interest on the Russian debt. There was also a payment to the Swedish Riksbank of \$500,000 (or \$500,000, the exact sum not having been determined). After the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, \$32,000,000 were sent to Berlin, which have since been transferred to France. The \$66,500,000 taken to Omsk were increased by \$25,000,000 from Rumania, representing the gold reserve of the State bank. The soviet government has paid to the banking firm of Niels Juul & Co., in Christiania, Norway, the sum of \$36,000,000 in gold; further amounts have been sent to England and America (via Sweden), but these sums have not been given out.

SOVIETS HAVE LITTLE LEFT.

An examination of these figures seems to show that the soviet government can not have much of the yellow metal left, unless, as is very likely, all gold in private possession down to every kind of article of personal adornment has been confiscated. It is also said that the government has despoiled the church of its sacred treasures, and that lately the gold mines of Siberia have again begun to yield considerable quantities of the metal.

I call particular attention to the figures furnished by the soviet paper, which forms the basis of the article from the Journal of Commerce, which I have just presented. It will be observed that this bolshevik organ admits that the gold supply of Russia decreased during the first year of the war, so that but \$82,000,000 remained. The article also supports statements made as to a further dissipation of Russia's gold supply, including more than \$150,000,000 paid to Germany under the treaty of Brest-Litovsk. It may be safely assumed in the light of this testimony, as well as all other accumulated facts, that the quantity of gold in the possession of the bolsheviks is not great, and is within the limit placed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I also call attention to the fact that this bolshevik organ refers to Mr. W. T. Novitsky, who was assistant to the last financial minister of the Czar, and apparently indorses his statement as to the gold supply of the Russian Government in 1914.

In the annual report of the Director of the Mint for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, there appears an extract from an article entitled "Gold stock and production since 1914 in Russia." This article, written by W. T. Novitsky, former assistant minister of finance of the all-Russian Government, was published in the New York Times on July 4 and reprinted in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, New York, July 24, 1920. The article is as follows:

The gold reserve in the vaults of the State Bank in 1914 amounted to the record figure of 1,601,000,000 rubles (\$823,714,500). The policy of concentrating the gold stock was facilitated by the good crops in 1909 and 1910, as well as the increasing gold production in Siberia from 1910 to 1913.

From the end of 1914 to early in 1917 Russia sold to England gold to the amount of \$68,000,000 (\$330,000,000). Part of this went to England via Archangel, part to Japan, and part to Canada.

At the end of 1917 Russia delivered to Sweden for supplies gold to the amount of \$2,500,000.

In November, 1917, the gold reserve amounted to more than \$600,000,000, of which one half was stored in Samara and later in Kazan, the other half in Moscow and Petrograd.

After the treaty of Brest-Litovsk the Bolsheviki delivered from Moscow to Berlin \$160,000,000 of gold. This was later surrendered to the Allies and is now at the Bank of France.

In July, 1918, the Bolsheviki were forced to evacuate Kazan, leaving to the Czecho-Slovaks and consequently to the People's Government \$330,000,000 of gold. This gold was first removed to Samara and later to Ufa; it was later moved to Tcheliabinsk, where it was to be stored in the vaults of the State Bank, but the cars containing the gold found their way to Omsk. Admiral Kolchak later absorbed the People's Government. The balance sheet of the Omsk State Bank gives as a basic figure the amount of \$332,915,653.

In May, 1919, the Omsk Government shipped to Vladivostok \$144,076,719, of which \$21,773,722 was seized by Gen. Semenov and held in Tohita, \$22,753,538 was sold to the French Government, French and British firms, \$12,432,795 was sold to the Japanese, and deposits were made for operations of an Anglo-American syndicate \$46,835,277, for Japanese operations \$16,330,291, and for purchase of munitions in America \$2,177,372; the remainder, about \$21,700,000, was stored in the State Bank at Vladivostok; and when Kolchak evacuated Omsk there was left \$210,406,692 of the original \$332,915,653 of gold. On January 7, 1920, Admiral Kolchak was taken from Omsk to Irkutsk, where he was handed over to the Bolsheviki. The gold which was to

accompany him was taken by the Czecho-Slovaks and later delivered to the Bolsheviki as per terms of armistice. Part of it was lost in transit.

Much of the gold produced in the country is not made a matter of record. Official data give the production for 1910 as \$38,855,000; 1913, \$40,433,000; and 1914, \$44,157,000, of which 80 per cent is Siberia's share and 20 per cent from the Urals. Since then Siberia alone produced \$32,660,000 in 1915 and \$21,774,000 in 1916; and, according to unofficial data available to the ministry of finance at Omsk, \$16,330,000 in 1917 and \$10,886,861 yearly in 1918 and 1919. The author estimates the actual production during these years at not less than 3,600 poods (about \$40,000,000) per annum, of which much fell into the hands of the Bolsheviki at Irkutsk.

The minister of finance has therefore definitely accounted for approximately \$846,900,000 of Russia's 1914 stock and subsequent production to the beginning of 1920, as follows:

Sold to England	\$330,000,000
Sold to Sweden	2,500,000
To Germany, by Brest-Litovsk treaty, now held by France	160,000,000
Seized by Gen. Semenov and held in Tohita	21,773,722
Sold to French Government, French and British firms	22,753,538
Sold for Japanese operations	16,330,291
Sold to Japanese	12,432,795
Sold to Anglo-American syndicate	46,835,277
Sold to America for guns	2,177,372
Held in State Bank of Vladivostok	21,700,000
Held by the bolsheviki	210,406,692

Total \$846,900,687

It will be observed that this writer credits the Russian Government with having \$150,000,000 in gold in 1914. I have made considerable investigation with a view to ascertaining the quantity of gold owned by the Russian Government in August, 1914, and the amount attributed to her by Mr. Novitsky is somewhat greater than many of the figures that I obtained. However, Mr. Novitsky was in a position to secure accurate information concerning Russia's financial condition not only in 1914 but down to the time when he wrote the article referred to; and he enjoyed opportunities to learn what disposition was made of this gold supply between 1914 and 1920. Senators will observe that \$330,000,000 worth of gold was sold to England. The bolsheviks delivered to Germany, after the Brest-Litovsk treaty, gold of the value of \$160,000,000. After accounting for the various amounts lost or disposed of by the bolshevik régime, the writer states that the amount held by the bolsheviki at the beginning of 1920 was \$210,406,692. Whether this includes the Rumanian gold I am not able to state definitely, but am inclined to believe that the amount stated is exclusive of the amount deposited in the Russian treasury by Rumania.

This factor must also be taken into account. Bolsheviki seized all gold, silver, and jewelry that they could lay their hands upon. They robbed, plundered, and despoiled, and undoubtedly secured a considerable quantity of booty from helpless Russians, some of whom were not only robbed of their possessions but foully murdered. Authentic information has been furnished from time to time of the world-wide propaganda carried on by the communist dictatorship. Their representatives have penetrated into most countries, where they have endeavored to spread discontent, disrupt the industrial life of the people, and prepare revolutionary movements. They have carried on an insidious and persistent propaganda in South America, Europe, Asia, and in the United States; they have attempted to corrupt labor organizations and to precipitate strikes in order that business might be paralyzed and the economic life of the people arrested, so that in the chaotic conditions which it was expected would follow communistic organizations could be effected which would hold communion with the bolsheviks of Russia and be guided by the destructive program of the third internationale. Bolshevik emissaries have been arrested in European countries, and jewels and gold have been found in their possession. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland have at various times been the centers of bolshevik propaganda and revolutionary conspiracies. It is, of course, impossible to even approximate the amount of gold expended by the bolsheviks in their revolutionary activities. Their agents have been, and now are, in Persia and in China, and they have spies and chosen representatives in India, where they hope to inaugurate a revolutionary movement which will culminate in the expulsion of Great Britain from that land and add India to the ranks of the communistic organizations. In my opinion, it can be stated with absolute certainty that many millions of dollars had been expended by Lenin and Trotski in this conspiracy to destroy the Governments of the world. They have declared that bolshevism would fall in Russia unless other nations were drawn into its vortex, and so with unflagging zeal the campaign to destroy all national lines and bring about world communism has been prosecuted with frenzied energy.

Permit me to digress for a moment to refer to a statement made in the manifesto, adopted by the congress of the communist internationale at Moscow, March, 1919, which was prepared by Lenin. It is there stated that—

It is the task of the communists to gather together all forces of all the true revolutionary proletarian parties in order to further and hasten the complete victory of the communist revolution.

And in one of the closing paragraphs of this document these words appear:

The task of the international communist party is now to overthrow this order (meaning the Governments of the world) denominated bourgeois governments, and to erect in its place the structure of the socialist world order.

In the rules announced to govern the communistic internationale it is declared that—

seizure of political power by the proletariat means destruction of the political power of the bourgeois. * * * Conquest of the political power means not merely a change in the personnel of ministration but the annihilation of the enemy apparatus of government; disarmament of the bourgeoisie, of the counter-revolutionary officers, of the White Guard; arming of the proletariat, the revolutionary soldiers, the Red Guard of Workingmen; displacement of all bourgeois judges and organization of proletarian courts; elimination of control by reactionary Government officials and substitution of new organs of management of the proletariat.

To carry out this program, the bolsheviks have been prodigal in their expenditures. Mr. President, the amount of gold now held by the bolsheviks can not possibly exceed \$300,000,000, including the Rumanian and French gold and the millions stolen from the Russian people. I omitted to state another pertinent matter which should be taken into account in determining the propriety of receiving, if it were possible, gold from the hands of the bolsheviks. It is known that they not only robbed and plundered Russians but they seized all plants, business enterprises, and property belonging to aliens. There were hundreds of millions of dollars of investments in Russia made by Americans, Italians, French, Japanese, Englishmen—indeed by nationals from nearly every country of the world. Large quantities of gold and silver were forcibly taken from the representatives of these aliens and confiscated by the bolshevik dictatorship. It is impossible, of course, to even estimate the value of the property of which they were despoiled. These persons have given notice that the soviet dictatorship has seized their gold and jewelry and other property, and nations and individuals are warned against purchasing or receiving gold or silver or jewelry and other forms of property from the Lenin and Trotsky government.

Perhaps no man in the United States has a greater knowledge of conditions in Russia than Mr. John Spargo, the eminent American Socialist writer. Mr. Spargo has written a most instructive work upon Russia and has published many illuminating articles upon Russian trade and the bolshevik régime. Whether one agrees with the political or economic views of Mr. Spargo or not, no one doubts his intellectual honesty or his fidelity to what he understands to be the truth. Mr. Spargo has recently written a most instructive article entitled "The problem of trading with soviet Russia."

I think it is the finest contribution that has been made to this question. In that article he states that after extensive inquiries into the subject of the gold and platinum reserve of soviet Russia, he reached the conclusion some time ago that—
it did not exceed 600,000,000 rubles, or about \$300,000,000.

He further states—

When I was in London, in September and October, 1920, I checked up my figures against those compiled by the highest authorities in the service of the British Government and found that these investigators, working quite independently, had arrived at practically identical conclusions. Since that estimate was made there has been some not inconsiderable augmentation from the total, from various sources, including military conquest, confiscations, and mining, but in all probability the expenditure for goods and propaganda abroad has been greater. It is quite safe to say that the total now in the possession of the soviet government does not exceed 500,000,000 rubles or \$250,000,000.

Mr. Spargo calls attention to the fact that about \$120,000,000 of the gold in the possession of the bolsheviks belongs to Rumania and that France claims 50,000,000 francs, deposited in the Russian State Bank and confiscated by the bolsheviks. If the French and Rumanian gold now in the possession of the bolsheviks were subtracted from the quantity which they hold, the aggregate amount of their possessions, as stated by Mr. Spargo, would be reduced pro tanto. Mr. Spargo calls attention to another very significant fact which supports the contention that the amount of gold now in the possession of the bolsheviks is very much less than is usually asserted. Recently German manufacturers of locomotives attempted to arrange with the bolsheviks to supply them with locomotives. When these manufacturers insisted upon gold being deposited to insure payment for the locomotives, the bolsheviks refused to meet the demands, and upon investigation it was discovered that the reserve of the so-called soviet government was inadequate to meet the 600,000,000 marks which were to be paid for the locomotives.

A most vigorous propaganda has been waged in the United States by the bolsheviks and by others to compel our Government to accord recognition to the bolshevik dictatorship. Fanci-

ful pictures have been drawn about the great resources of Russia and the volume of trade which we could secure if this course were taken. Labor organizations have been appealed to in support of this propaganda, and it has reached an acute stage since there has been a recession in the tide of domestic production and many factories have either closed their doors or reduced their output. There are, doubtless, many individuals who sincerely believe that Russia is in a position to purchase a portion of our surplus products, either by supplying us with commodities which the Russian people produce and which we require or by paying us gold.

Extravagant statements are repeated that Russia has enormous quantities of flax, hides, sugar, timber, and other products which she would be glad to exchange for our manufactured products. Some of our business men have been misled by these representations and the intensity of the campaign waged by Martens, the deported representative of the soviets, as well as others who have echoed his refrain. And there are those in our midst who are clamoring for recognition by the United States of the soviet dictatorship, who are not inspired by any desire to help Russia or the American people and whose knowledge of conditions in Russia is such as to convince them that trade with her is impossible. Their interest is inspired by their hostility to our Government and their devotion to communism. They desire the recognition of the bolsheviks in order to give them strength and to multiply their opportunities to propagandize for the overthrow of this and other nations. I charge that there is a conspiracy, which as to some of the participants is akin to treason, upon the part of bolsheviks in Russia and communists in the United States to compel the recognition of the soviet dictatorship. All means available are employed by these alien enemies in our midst, as well as by some unpatriotic Americans, to deceive the American people and to forward the cause of international communism. Some of those who are evincing so much interest in Lenin and Trotsky and bolshevism should leave this Republic. Their malignant influence makes them dangerous to the peace and good order of the Republic. They are exotic growths—perhaps I should say they are deadly parasites—and have no place in a free republic. They are not needed here. They belong in some other land. I have too much sympathy for the suffering Russian people to wish that these poisonous and malignant figures should be forced upon them, but I feel that their departure from the United States would be for the best interests of our country.

The Senator from Maryland has emphasized in his remarks to-day, as well as in his statement a few days ago, the great trade which we could enjoy if we would accept the gold held by the soviet régime. Mr. President, I have shown how insignificant is the gold supply of Russia. Assuming that the soviet dictatorship possesses three or four hundred million dollars in gold, it is obvious to every person who gives the matter a moment's thought that a quantity so limited would not be parted with by a government or a revolutionary junta. Even if it were willing to do so it would be the basis of but a small amount of trade between Russia and the United States or other nations. The exports of our country during the last calendar year were approximately \$8,000,000,000. Our imports were about \$6,000,000,000. It is certain that the bolsheviks would not part with all their gold; but assuming that we could obtain the entire amount, it is so limited that it would scarcely affect our foreign commerce. Russia needs to-day \$30,000,000,000 for capital investment for the development of her resources. Her pressing needs call for commodities of the value of five to eight billions of dollars. The supply of gold controlled by the bolsheviks would scarcely purchase the medicines now so much needed in Russia or the agricultural implements for one of her provinces.

When it is recalled that last year there were cleared through the banks of a small city in North Carolina nearly \$100,000,000 for automobiles and automobile accessories we will obtain some idea of the unimportance of two or three hundred millions of gold as it relates to or affects the needs of the Russian people. The Senator from Maryland has insisted that the attitude of the Treasury of the United States was an obstacle to Russian trade. He criticizes, as I understand him, the action of the Treasury in refusing to mint gold of soviet origin. The Senator referred to the statute concerning the minting of gold, and I stated that I would produce it. Section 3519 of the Revised Statutes provides:

Any owner of gold bullion may deposit the same at any mint, to be formed into coin or bars for his benefit. * * *

It will be observed that the mint is authorized to coin the gold bullion of "any owner." It seems manifest that it would have no authority to coin bullion which was stolen or which was presented by thieves or those into whose possession the

stolen bullion had come. It would be highly immoral for the Government to open its mints to the coinage of stolen bullion. If the Government knows that bullion presented for mintage is stolen property, it has no right to receive it; and if it should purchase it, it should be held liable to the owner. I shall not argue as to whether there would be legal liability, but certainly there would be moral responsibility. Section 3545 of the Revised Statutes declares that—

For the purpose of enabling the mints and the assay office in New York to make returns to depositors with as little delay as possible, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to keep in such mints and assay office, when the state of the Treasury will admit thereof, such an amount of public money or bullion procured for the purpose as he shall judge convenient and necessary, out of which those who bring bullion to the said mints and assay office may be paid the value thereof in coin or bars as soon as practicable after the value has been ascertained. On payment thereof being made, the bullion so deposited shall become the property of the United States.

It will thus be seen that bullion brought for mintage is purchased by the Government, and payment is made for the same either in coin or bars. Of course, if gold from the bolsheviks were brought to our mints, the purpose would be to sell it to the Government for American money. The Government, in other words, would become the purchaser of this gold.

It is insisted that all restrictions at the mint be removed, and that gold of soviet origin be purchased by the Government and paid for with American dollars. The Treasury of the United States, observing the statute—the letter as well as the spirit—has required that any person tendering gold for mintage shall sign a certificate of ownership in which the person tendering it represents and warrants that said gold is not of bolshevik origin. If the Senator from Maryland or any other person will offer gold at the Treasury and give the requisite certificate of ownership, there will be no difficulty in selling the gold to the Government and receiving in payment therefor coins of the United States.

During the discussion between the Senator from Maryland and myself several days ago I suggested that if the mints of our country were advised that bullion produced from our own mines and offered for mintage had been stolen, or if there was a question as to its ownership, the officials of the Government would refuse to purchase it. The Government of the United States does not intend to be a receiver of stolen goods, whether they are of domestic or of foreign origin, and I am at a loss to comprehend the point of view of those who see nothing improper or immoral in the Government of the United States buying at its mints gold tendered by the soviets—gold which everyone knows belongs to Rumania or France or private individuals or to the Russian people; gold which the brutal, thieving, military dictatorship of Russia by force and murder took from its owners. In the light of all the facts, I think it must be admitted that even if the mints were open to the coinage of this stolen gold, but little, if any, would come to our country, or, if it did, it would be unimportant in developing commercial transactions between the United States and Russia, so pitifully insignificant in amount that no appreciable quantity of commodities could be paid for.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator says Russia has some gold, but not sufficient to continue for any considerable time the purchase of American goods.

Mr. KING. Or any other goods.

Mr. SIMMONS. Or any other goods. I will ask the Senator if that is not so with reference to all of our foreign customers?

Mr. KING. Absolutely.

Mr. SIMMONS. If they had to pay in gold for the purchases they make in this country our export trade would soon come to naught.

Mr. KING. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Therefore, as Russia has but little gold that is available and other countries have but little gold that is available the only possible way of sustaining our foreign export trade is by taking foreign products in exchange.

Mr. KING. I regard the Senator's statement as correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. That situation applies not only to Russia but to all the world.

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Now, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] says that while Russia has a large quantity of gold it also has large quantities of raw materials that are very much needed in this country, some of them possibly not produced to any great extent in this country, and that if Russia could be allowed to export to this country her raw materials, supplemented with her gold reserve, whether large or small, it would open up a large opportunity for the sale of our goods to Russia. I wish the Senator to understand that I am not at all discussing the question as to whether we ought, under the existing political conditions, to open trade with Russia in a broad way. I am merely stating the general proposition with reference to the

difficulties that Russia would have, and trying to show that the same conditions apply to our trade everywhere else.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has a profound knowledge of economic matters and questions of trade and commerce. He has, in effect, stated that our foreign commerce depends upon the commodity production in those nations with which we trade. That must be apparent to all. The nations of Europe which are now so desperately in need of our commodities are unable to purchase because of their limited production. England and France and some other European nations have gold, but it is impossible for them to part with the small amount which they possess. Of course, the gold supply of England and France is considerable, but it is required to maintain gold reserves, though their reserves bear a very small ratio to their paper issues. The available gold supply of the world is approximately eight and one-half billion dollars. The foreign commerce of the United States, as I have already stated, exceeded \$13,000,000,000 during the past year. If the people of the United States had possessed the entire world supply of gold it would have been insufficient to pay for our exports. When we examine the average daily balances in the clearing houses of the United States and compare the total with the volume of money in circulation in the United States the impressive lesson is taught that the business of the country is conducted upon credits based on production rather than upon gold and silver. But a very small amount of gold was involved in our foreign commerce during the past year. Even the trade balances were settled not in gold but in obligations, securities, and capital investments. Gold, therefore, plays but a small part in international commerce.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has expressed the fear that Russia's trade might be absorbed by Germany to the permanent disadvantage of our country. The Senator, I have no doubt, sincerely believes that the utmost freedom of trade should be permitted between the Russian people and the people of the United States. As I have indicated heretofore, I sympathize with that view; but if the Senator seeks recognition of the bolshevik dictatorship, then we do not occupy common ground. There are no obstacles interposed by this Government to trade between Americans and Russians. Our American manufacturers are at perfect liberty to ship to Russia commodities in unlimited quantities. Our agriculturists will encounter no impediment from the Government to the sale of their products to the Russian people, or, if they wish, to the soviet government. Ships are lying in our harbors and their owners are anxious for cargo. If the Russian people have gold or commodities available for exchange for American products there is absolutely nothing to interfere with such exchange.

The fact is, Mr. President, that Russia has practically nothing to sell, and so can not buy; and if she did have unlimited products, the soviet dictatorship would prohibit all transactions except such as were dictated and controlled by it. In other words, the soviet régime has suppressed private property and trade and commerce between individuals or communities. Private ownership of property has been abolished and trade is a monopoly—a monopoly controlled by the dictatorship. All this talk about "Russian gold available for the purchase of American commodities" is absurd, and even if our mints were to remove all restrictions and purchase gold of soviet origin but little, if any, would ever be presented. Swedish nationals attempted to trade with Russia and consented to take Russian gold. A small quantity only was forwarded to Sweden, and that was so alloyed—the alloy being 25 per cent—that the transactions could not be completed, so that the efforts to develop trade between Russia and Sweden were unavailing. Later, a representative of an English firm entered into a contract with the bolsheviks for the sale of certain English commodities, but learning of the dishonest attempts to defraud Swedish business men by means of alloyed gold, a demand was made that before the gold was accepted by the English firm it should be assayed to determine its purity. The bolsheviks refused to accede to this demand, and the sale was defeated.

Numerous attempts have been made by the people of various countries of Europe to open up trade with Russia, but thus far failure has attended their efforts. It is true there has been a limited amount of trade between Russia and a few surrounding nations, but the amount is so insignificant as to scarcely be worthy of note. Mr. Simon, the foreign minister of Germany, stated to his Government a few days ago that Germany had endeavored in every possible way to open up trade with Russia, but had failed. He complained of the perfidy and dishonor of the bolsheviks, of their lack of moral standards, also of the fact that the exhausted condition of Russia left her nothing for export, and therefore prevented her from engaging in foreign trade.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if it will not interrupt the Senator—

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. A little while ago the Senator made a statement to the effect that our nationals could trade with the nationals of Russia.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. I think the facts, when clearly understood, will indicate that that can not be done with safety.

Mr. KING. Oh, I expressed no opinion as to the safety, but I said so far as our Government is concerned.

Mr. POMERENE. I mean so far as the soviet government is concerned. I have before me a little publication, known as the "Russian Economic Bulletin, Official Organ of the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce," printed in January, 1921, in which this paragraph appears:

FOREIGN TRADE DECREE OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT.

Poslednia Novosti, Paris, December 16, 1920, publishes the following decree by the soviet government in regard to foreign trade:

"All merchandise imported into Russia without a permit from the commissariat of foreign trade will be looked upon as a contraband and will be confiscated by the government."

The fact of the matter is that it is only the soviet government that can trade with outside countries or the nationals of outside countries, and the nationals of Russia are not permitted to trade on their own account.

Mr. KING. What the Senator states is true. The bolshevik organization has suppressed the cooperative societies to which the Senator from Maryland referred some time ago and has practically destroyed the business of Russia. There is no industry in Russia. The factories and plants have almost ceased to produce. The mines have either closed or their output is so restricted as to be of but little benefit to the economic life of the State. The transportation system is wrecked, and, indeed, confusion and disorder and chaos and despair reign wherever bolshevism is found. Whatever trade exists is either directed and controlled by the bolsheviks or is secretly carried on, and the bolshevik authorities are alert to prevent any traffic between Russian nationalists and the citizens of other nations, and where conducted and discovery is made, imprisonment or death often follow as punishment.

Recently Mr. H. G. Wells, the noted English socialist, went to Russia, and upon his return to England published a number of articles showing conditions there found and his impressions of the soviet leaders. Mr. Wells, let me add, if not a communist, is an apologist for communism. His articles do not present, in my opinion, a fair and dispassionate view of Russian conditions, and their speciousness if not dishonesty are apparent when he attempts to fasten responsibility for the chaos and ruin which prevail in Russia. In one of his articles appearing in the New York Times this statement is made:

It (bolshevism) has suppressed private ownership and private trade in Russia, not as an act of expediency but as an act of right, and in all Russia there remain now no commercial individuals and bodies with whom we can deal who will respect the conventions and usages of western commercial life. The bolshevik government, we have to understand, has by its nature an invincible prejudice against individual business men; it will not treat them in a manner that they will consider fair and honorable; it will distrust them and as far as it can put them at the complete disadvantage. It is hopeless and impossible, therefore, for individuals and firms to think of going into Russia to trade.

This damning indictment of the Russian communistic system is reluctantly admitted by this great apologist for their crimes and their failures. I hope the Senator from Maryland, as well as those who are agitating in the United States for Russian trade and a recognition of the bolshevik régime, will remember those words of Mr. Wells. I want them to recall again and again that Mr. Wells declares that the bolshevik government has "suppressed private ownership and private trade in Russia," and that this suppression is not an act of "expediency, but an act of right," and that in all of Russia there remain no commercial individuals and bodies with whom we can deal who will respect the conventions and usages of western commercial life.

Let me inquire in what manner do these agitators who are insisting that trade relations be established with Russia expect that their purposes shall be carried out? As I have said, there are no obstacles interposed by the Government. Why do not these men who desire to trade with Russia do so? It has been charged that Mr. Martens, who represented the bolsheviks in the United States for a long period, entered into many contracts with American manufacturing houses for the purchase by Russia of products supplied by these business firms. Of course, it is not true. But, if it were, why do not these American concerns ship the purchased articles to Russia? There will be no objection from this Government. Martens will soon be in Russia. If they desire to trade, I repeat, let them proceed. But they know that there is no chance for trade, that

there are no individuals who can or will purchase, and that their dealings, if any be had, must be exclusively with the dictatorship.

Mr. President, there has been a cunningly devised scheme by the bolshevik régime to deceive not only the American people but the people of other countries. It was contended, first, that Russia was ready to buy millions of dollars' worth of foreign products, but the embargo prevented. When the embargo was raised by the allied nations, and Russia was free to trade with whom she pleased, no products important enough to note flowed from or were carried into Russia. It became important that some other pretext be offered for the paucity of trade, and that pretext is found in the charge that the mints of the United States will not permit Russian gold to be coined. The bolshevik government desires recognition, not for trade, but that she may carry on through her ambassadors and representatives a wicked propaganda for the overthrow of nations which accord hospitality to her representatives.

Mr. President, referring to the alleged obstacles interposed by our Government to Russian trade, I direct attention to a letter written by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Norman H. Davis, on the 8th instant. It is in reply to a communication addressed to him by Alton B. Parker, president of the National Civil Federation. Judge Parker calls attention to the criticisms of the policy of the State Department in a "widely published declaration" emanating from an organization which hoped to influence the recent election. Mr. Davis, speaking for the Government, contradicts many of the statements contained in the communication of the organization referred to. He denies that it has been the policy of the Government "to refuse to permit relief to be sent to soviet Russia," and repeats what every one knows to be a fact, that the only restriction on export trade with soviet Russia relates to munitions or commodities susceptible of immediate military use, and that with respect to such commodities a special license may be applied for. If the reasons appear to be valid, doubtless such license will be granted. Not only is no license required with respect to other commodities, but no restriction on exports exists. Mr. Davis states—

That relatively little of these commodities have been sent, due to purely commercial considerations. Two different organizations have been carrying on a noisy agitation in this matter, asserting that they have been prevented by this Government from sending medical supplies to Russia. They have been informed that no such obstacles exist in regard to such shipments and apparently they have no funds to send supplies or pay for their transport.

The organizations referred to by Mr. Davis are undoubtedly engaged in bolshevik propaganda either knowingly or ignorantly. Mr. Davis further states that the Department of State has taken an "intense interest" in the possibility of arranging for large-scale relief work for Russia, and calls attention to the difficulties which have been raised by the "soviets who can not find in their theory of communism any excuse for private philanthropy." He further proceeds:

Representatives of the large relief organizations, with the knowledge and approval of the Department of State, have visited the central soviet authorities in Moscow in the hope of establishing a modus vivendi for such work, but were with two exceptions met by rebuffs.

In this matter the experience of this Government has been identical with that of European countries, both those who were associated with us in the war and the northern neutrals. The only relief work which the soviet will tolerate is a direct gift, and all supplies to the soviet government to be distributed by them as their own largess.

If the soviets will refuse to permit supplies, medicines, and gifts raised by charitable organizations to be distributed to the Russian people, it is manifest they will not permit business to be transacted between Russian nationals and other countries.

Mr. Davis continues:

It appears that American citizens who have gone to Russia for relief work among the sick and starving have been and still are held as hostages, and that the government's attitude toward relief workers is that which is assumed toward private business enterprises. Any American citizen is at liberty to enter Russia upon his own responsibility.

Mr. Davis refers to the fact that postal communications with soviet Russia could not be formally established without practical negotiations, and that such communications are based on a commercial contract and implies solvency on both sides. However, as Mr. Davis states, there is no refusal to permit communications, and that, "as a matter of fact, it is well known that letters do pass between the two territories." Any impediment to the fullest exchange of commodities between Russia and other countries depends solely upon the soviet power in Russia.

Mr. Alexander, Secretary of the Department of Commerce, under date of January 14, stated that his department was ready to aid American firms wishing to trade with Russia, and that commercial attachés at Stockholm, Copenhagen, and other

points will furnish such aid as they can, but that goods shipped would be at the peril of the exporter, as the Government could not assume responsibility.

The New York Times, Sunday, December 3, 1920, contains the following editorial, which is very illuminating, upon the question of Russian trade. I desire to submit it as a part of my remarks:

FAITHLESS RUSSIA.

The campaign for recognition of the bolshevik government is going on vigorously all over the world and has, of course, gained strength from the collapse of all the Russian armies opposed to the reds. Russia is at peace for the moment, and the friends, admirers, or would-be creditors of the bolsheviks are doing all they can to get the rest of the world to call bygones bygones. Their favorite complaint is that politics and business are being confused; that it is stupid not to trade with a people because you disapprove of its government.

It is an old argument and one which has again and again been refuted by the declarations of the bolshevik leaders themselves. Yet it is still repeated, so it may be worth while to repeat the refutation. The rest of the world is reluctant to trade with the bolsheviks, not because it disapproves of their government, but because they disapprove of its Governments. They disapprove of those Governments so violently that their creed permits, in theory, no compromise. The bolsheviks have occasionally, when it suited their need, promised that they would make no efforts to foment revolution in the States which might have dealings with them; but in making that promise they are denying their own religion. There has been no evidence that they would keep those promises if it suited their convenience to break them. To-day the bolshevik government is talking peace and trade; but Mr. Zinovieff, of the third international, that government's agency for making trouble abroad, is telling socialists of other countries that "we need real revolutionary fighters, not diplomats."

Trade implies certain standards of dealing. Thousands of years of commerce have created certain traditions and understandings as to what is done and what is not done. It is bad form to accept payment in stolen money, for example; and that is not a mere arbitrary moral judgment; it rests on the fact that long experience has proved that it does not pay to accept payment in stolen money. But much of what the bolsheviks have to offer is precisely that. Their right to the gold of the Russian Government may ultimately be conceded if their government is recognized; but the gold belonging to Rumania must be regarded as stolen by any legal standard. The Russian gold, for that matter, is the security for the Russian debt, held chiefly in France; and until the bolsheviks acknowledge that debt a business man who sells them goods on credit is taking some chances.

There is in Russia, of course, much besides gold that can be used, eventually, in payment for foreign goods. Very little of it can be used now. Much of the natural wealth of the country has been seized by the bolshevik government. The former owners are not compensated. An article in the Weekly Review reports that some British banks have refused to honor checks of certain Russian companies on their balances in those banks, because the bolshevik government has seized their property at home, and if it is recognized will have a claim on their property abroad. This may be the beginning of a new morality, but business men used to dealings under the old morality will find it hard to adjust themselves to it. A government which can confiscate one man's property can confiscate another man's property. Very few, if any, are the persons who oppose trade with Russia because they do not like the politics of the Russian leaders. But there are excellent reasons against trading with Russia in the commercial practice of those leaders, as well as in their determination to make the politics of every nation like their own.

The fact is, as was stated in the editorial of the Times in its issue of December 29, 1920, that "a civilization which recognizes property rights has not yet discovered how to deal with the civilization that does not."

I mentioned a few moments ago the statement of Dr. Walter Simons, the foreign secretary in Germany, read before the Reichstag on the 20th of this month. The Associated Press, in reporting the matter, states that the official declaration resulted from an interpellation by independent Socialists, who demanded to know what steps the Government proposed to take to establish relations with Germany's eastern neighbor, "which are equally profitable and necessary for both countries." In answering the interpellation, Dr. Simons said:

The German Government has not been able to alter the conditions which have complicated political and trade intercourse with Russia throughout the whole world. The reason for this is found primarily in the complete evolution of Russia from her former economic system, her artificial isolation from the sea, her inaccessibility by land, and the total collapse of the Russian transportation facilities. The final obstacle is found in the soviet government's principles governing international trade and its attitude with respect to revolutionary propaganda.

Dr. Simons further stated that an additional reason for the failure to trade with Russia grew out of the persistency with which the soviet régime had attempted to "carry on political agitation in Germany." When Dr. Simons refers to the "final obstacle" preventing international trade being the attitude of the soviets with respect to revolutionary propaganda, it clearly demonstrates why Germany is unable to carry on commercial relations with Russia. Germany is seeking trade, and her revival is quite remarkable in view of all conditions. She would gladly sell to Russia, but finds it impossible because Russia has nothing to export, and the soviet régime is more interested in destroying the Republic of Germany than she is in trade and commerce. There are hundreds of thousands of Germans in Russia, and there are many reasons why Germany would secure exports from Russia in preference to other nations, and yet there is no appreciable trade between the two countries.

In the Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn, a bolshevik paper, September 3, 1920, appears an article by the Communist Economist Bagaiev, in which he says:

At the present moment, when there is a famine in all branches of industrial and personal consumption, there can, as a rule, be no question of the existence of any surplus for export. We shall have to export what we are in great need of ourselves, merely for the purpose of getting something more indispensable in exchange. Every imported locomotive, every plow we get, will have to be paid for literally with strips carved from the body of our national industries. Under these circumstances it would be wrong to spend either our gold or, still more, our precious stocks of exportable commodities.

This is the statement of a communist whose interest is to present in the most favorable light conditions in Russia. He speaks of "famine" and makes clear the sad and wretched plight of Russia when he refers to the "strips carved from the body of national industries."

In an article entitled "Soviet Russia's Foreign Trade," published in the New Russia, a London weekly, this statement appears:

Practically speaking, in 1918 there were no imports except coal, which formed over 90 per cent of the total. It was coal supplied to the government delayed on the way, and which reached Russia after it was no longer needed. But, to make up for that, in 1918 there were animated negotiations between Sweden and Russia—not, indeed, with reference to imports, but to exports from Russia of money, tokens, and valuables—mostly in couriers' bags. Nineteen hundred and nineteen was the year of effective blockade. Foreign trade was resumed in 1920. At first there were merely chance imports, and then on the conclusion of peace with Esthonia imports became steadier.

The statement, which is instructive, further continues; and without reading I ask that it be inserted as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

The portion to be inserted is as follows:

Imports through Esthonian frontier in 1920.

	June.	July.	Apr. 18- July 31.	Included in July.
	<i>Poods.</i>	<i>Poods.</i>	<i>Poods.</i>	
Foodstuffs.....	52,630	81,124	904,925	52
Manufactured animal products.....	3,573	42,805	46,378	1,098
Chemical products.....	33,843	45,930	797,773	36
Manufactured metals.....	149,817	89,517	269,228	140
Paper goods.....	89,887	90,907	194,025	5

¹ Decrease.

Thus rich Russia has to feed at the expense of poor Esthonia. Moreover, correspondents from Reval have repeatedly written that it is apparent that Esthonia is being gradually devastated by the bolsheviks.

Another interesting point is the decrease in the imports of metal manufactures, which fell nearly 40 per cent for July as compared with June. Does not this show that up to July Russia imported Esthonia's reserve stocks, and in July there was not enough to keep up the level of the imports for the preceding month?

The enormous quantity of paper imports is also remarkable. The figures are especially significant when compared with the communique in the Petrograd Pravda for September 8 to the effect that the consumption of paper for printing notes is 800 poods per diem, and that measures have been taken to buy paper of the best quality abroad.

Travelers who have recently returned from Riga have brought word of the great paper shortage in Russia, which recently compelled the soviet government to order that only 10,000-ruble notes be printed, notes which are worth 20 cents in American currency. Notes below this are not equal in value to the paper on which they are printed.

EXPORT DATA MERELY BLUFF.

"In connection with this," the writer continues, "the question arises, What is Russia exporting at present? Judging from the bolshevik newspapers, there was a preliminary inventory of goods available for export, of which there were considerable stocks. Practically, however, the only commodities at the disposal of the bolsheviks were gold and jewelry, etc., which were included in the inventory. And, indeed, we see in the statistics of transports through Narva, which by some chance happened to be published in one of the numbers of the Pravda, a mention of railway cars going toward Reval. Logically, this might have been surmised even without bolshevik figures, because, of course, in an utterly ruined country there is at present no surplus, and the data of any so-called 'export stock' can only be a bluff."

The absence of exports will be the chief stumblingblock to the renewal of trade. It is true that in his article Bagaiev sees other obstacles besides this.

The only exportable commodity in Russia as a whole has been set aside by various commissariats, and, moreover, as the commissariat for foreign trade had no proper machinery of trade, either central or local, the Government departments have been forced willy-nilly to have recourse to a system of petty trading."

It is true that departmental separatism has disappeared, but there is still no common plan of action in the form of a practical business program, this being replaced by separate disconnected schemes. The fact of the importation from abroad of a large number of children's spades, pruning knives, etc., at a time when Russia is suffering from the great want of technical appliances is a good proof that the work of the commissariat of foreign trade has been performed only casually.

Of course, the absence of any plan is an obstacle, but even a proper plan could not do away with the inherent defect. So long as the bolsheviks continue to pay exclusively in gold, the opening of the frontiers can not attain its object, i. e., the renewal of economic life. What is the use of importing thousands of locomotives if the country has nothing to transport except soldiers?

So long as the bolsheviks continue to think of conquering the world, no imports can help them, because it is only the productive forces of the country that are unlimited, and not the gold, which is required to pay for both foreign imports and propaganda abroad.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Maryland stated that Russia has large supplies of flax, platinum, and other commodities which are available for export. Mr. President, the facts disprove the Senator's contention.

I have called attention to the article by Bagaiev showing the impoverished condition of Russia. In the same organ of the bolshevik, *Pravda*, and in its issue of January 3, 1921, this statement appears:

Hitherto we have been living on the stores and machinery, the means of production we inherited from the bourgeoisie. We have been using the old stores of raw materials, half manufactured and manufactured goods. But these stores are getting exhausted and the machinery is wearing out more and more.

Mr. President, few persons outside of Russia appreciate the tragic and awful conditions there prevailing. I have before me hundreds of excerpts from bolshevik papers which admit the appalling conditions and do not attempt to disguise the woe and famine and starvation which are devastating that unhappy nation. Many of these articles refer to the typhus plague as well as other diseases which are ravaging the country. There is constant reference to the lack of fuel supply and to the failure of the coal mines to produce. In the official bolshevik organ, *Pravda*, this item recently appeared:

The deliveries of grain in all the Provinces amount to 55,557,000 poods instead of the scheduled 443,500,000 poods. In other words, the deliveries have not exceeded 12.4 per cent of the schedule.

The paper, after stating these facts, declares that serious pressure must be brought to bear upon the food-supply organizations as well as upon the masses of the peasantry, "otherwise an increase of unrest among the population of the starving districts may be expected."

In a report read at the Fifth All-Russian Convention of Trade Unions it was reported that the provisioning, even of the—

first-class privileged factories and plants, does not exceed 30 to 35 per cent of the required norms. In reality, the workers obtain only 6-8 pounds of bread a month instead of the official 30. This makes it necessary to considerably reduce the number of privileged workers from 5,000,000 to two and one-half and to deprive their families of extra rations.

In its issue of December 1, 1920, the *Volia Rossii* reprints an article from the Vorwaerts, the German Social Democrat organ, Berlin, containing a speech delivered by the Russian menshevik leader, Abramovitch, in which he describes the economic and other conditions of Russia. He states that the output of Russian industry, which was wholly inadequate to supply Russia's demands in peace times, is from 6 to 10 per cent of what it formerly was.

Before the war 1,200 plants were engaged in the manufacture of iron and other metal goods. To-day but 21 factories are working, and they are working mainly for the requirements of the army and the State. From 5 to 15 per cent only of the pre-war volume of coal is produced, and even the limited production in Russia can not be made available because of the destruction of the transportation system. The supplies of salt are but 10 per cent of the needs of the people. The speaker declared that Russia is unable to feed herself because of the socialization of the land and the conflicts between the bolsheviks and the peasants:

The latter stubbornly resist the requisitions of the bolsheviks, as a result of which there are frequent uprisings and entire villages are destroyed by fire and artillery action.

In the *Volia Rossii*—which is a daily published in Prague by leaders of the socialist revolutionists and edited by Mr. Zen-zinov and others—a number of articles appear in the issues of December 1, 4, 8, 10, 14, and 18, 1920, which set forth Russian conditions. The articles are written by Boras Sokolov, a Russian economist and a member of the party just mentioned. After visiting Russia and carefully examining into conditions, he states that the Russian proletariat has shrunk to one-fifteenth of its former size; that workers have, so far as possible, left the cities and returned to the rural villages, where they are attempting to open small workshops such as might be found in primitive times among widely scattered pastoral communities. Reference is made to the fact that the chemical industry has lost 80 per cent of its workers and that the textile manufacturing industry has similarly suffered. The rubber industry in 1916 had 30,000 workers; in 1920 but 6,000. In 1917 there were 172,000 in the paper industry and in 1920 but 18,000. Engaged in the glass and crockery industry there were, in 1917, 123,000 workers, and in 1920 but 21,000. The record is also conclusive that those who still labor in the manufacturing industries and in plants, factories, and mills are so inefficient that but little is accomplished and that their lack of nourishment prevents, even if the desire existed, the performance of an average day's labor. Bread, which formerly cost 2 kopeks, now brings 350 rubles; and sugar, which before the war sold for 15 kopeks,

costs now 4,500 rubles. Notwithstanding the enormous wages in bolshevik degraded currency, the wages actually received are twenty times less than in 1917. The communist Novikov reported to the Moscow Provincial Convention of Chemical Workers, held July 17, 1920, that—

Never before have the chemical workers found themselves in so difficult a situation as now. They are actually starving, having neither a sufficient ration nor money to purchase the necessary foodstuffs. The same condition prevails at the Troitsky works where the working-day exceeds 10 hours.

The report of the convention in August, 1920, states that the workers of the Putilov works are—

literally starving, subsisting only on bread and the soviet soup. "We are completely exhausted from overtime work and poor nourishment and have no money to buy milk for our children."

When it is remembered that the Putilov works are the important steel works of the bolsheviks, necessary for their war purposes, it furnishes convincing proof of the distress and starvation and utter economic collapse in Russia. The conditions of the employees in the factories and plants are so wretched as to be almost unbelievable. A resolution of the Petrograd workers was adopted on September 5, 1920, which states:

We feel as if we were hard-labor convicts, where everything but our feeding has been made subject to iron rules. We have become lost as human beings and have been turned into slaves.

I should have mentioned that labor has been militarized. Compulsory work is enforced, a fact reported by the *Ekonomicheskaya Zhizu* in its Nos. 147, 164, and 144, recently published.

The disintegration of the proletariat working forces has been so pronounced that in order to prevent its absolute destruction the soviets began to militarize the industries in 1920. The railroads first came under the military orders. Later other industries were included, among them being coal mining, metallurgical, lumber, flour mills, and sugar industries. The employees are compelled to submit to the military orders and are punished for slight infractions of the same. In the *Metalist*, official organ of the Metal Trades Works, in its issue No. 3, 1920, this statement is made:

The same punishment is meted out for refusal to do compulsory overtime work, and in case of persistent refusal the culprit is haled before the court.

In an editorial in *N. Armia* No. 7, 1920, it is stated that—

The distinction between soldier and the worker must be wiped out; the same harsh discipline, the same unconditional obedience must exist for both.

The Department of Commerce of our Government has recently published a pamphlet upon the economic conditions in soviet Russia. An examination of this publication confirms the reports to which I referred and conclusively establishes the fact that, for the present, there can be no trade with Russia no matter how desirous we might be to engage in trade. The moral degeneration of workers is referred to, their refusal to meet the demands to increase working hours, and the attempts to increase the productivity of labor.

Reference is made to a large factory in northern Russia, formerly employing ten to fifteen thousand men, and in 1919 employing but 2,000 men. Mention is made of a large machinery construction plant near Moscow, constructed before the war, and which was thoroughly modern. From January, 1919, onward, 1,000 men were at work in the factory. Every effort was made to induce production, but notwithstanding such efforts, up to March, 1920, not a single machine had been delivered, though, during the year 1919, the expenditure upon the works reached 25,000,000 rubles. In another factory, confiscated by the soviets, the cost of manufacturing a motor-car sprocket, in January, 1919, was 25,000 rubles. The same kind of a sprocket produced in pre-war times by the owner cost 30 rubles. The cost of railway operation is presented, which reveals the breakdown in the transport system. In one month of 1918 wages exceeded the yearly wages for preceding years, and were six times as great as the receipts. It will be noted that the bulletin to which I am referring is not brought down to include the year 1920. It is known that conditions are much more serious now than they were in 1918 or 1919, covered by the review of the Department of Commerce. Attention is given to the question of Russia's raw materials. The department states that—

The war and then the revolution paralyzed the supply in all industries, because, during the last three years, there has been little production in Russia and consumption has been at the expense of reserves of former years, which are becoming exhausted. It is only the enormous decrease in consumption and the reduction in personal requirements to a minimum, in most cases, indeed, following the minimum, that has disguised the national crisis in the question of supply. Besides, the internal causes of decay inherent in all forms of industrial life in Russia, at the present time the production and supply of raw materials were also affected by the shortage of fuel for industries and by the disorganization of transport.

The report further declares that—

Until Russia's shortage of metal is remedied there can be no hope of any extensive development of industry.

Further speaking of the iron and steel situation, the report states:

It is of no use to reckon on the extension of industry, and still less use to dream of being able to carry out any of the grand schemes which are constantly being brought forward and which produce the impression that in the near future Russia's technical progress will exceed that of other and more cultured and industrially more developed countries. Even on the former modest scale of industrial development, Russia must for some time to come be dependent on foreign capital and influence to a very great extent. In this respect all tempting delusions are a far greater danger to the country than the knowledge of even the most bitter truth.

The Senator from Maryland claimed that Russia was in possession of large quantities of flax. The report says:

For the present moment, when for four years Russia itself has been existing by absorbing its old stores, not by producing new ones, and when the economic life of the country has been destroyed along its whole front, there can be no question in this sphere, either, of the existence of supplies in sufficient quantities to be important to the State.

These words are found in the discussion of the flax situation. There was no production of flax, so that it may be safely assumed there is none for exportation. The report, on page 19, states that in the sphere of fundamental industries, such as "the textile and the animal industries"—referring to raw materials of animal origin, such as hides, tallow, and so forth—"the country will for a considerable period have to struggle to satisfy its home demands, to which end large sums will be required for restoring that which has been destroyed."

Speaking of the attempts to distribute the supplies, whether of raw materials or other products confiscated and controlled by the soviets, the report states that chaos prevails everywhere, that the soviet institutions have an enormous number of employees, who are incompetent and inefficient, and that owing to constant speculations on a large scale the warehouses are closed a portion of the time, ostensibly for "stock taking." The report adds:

In general, after functioning for about a fortnight, the stores have to be closed for some time to ascertain how much has been stolen by the employees.

The results of the soviet industrial policy are presented, and facts demonstrate that there is a return to primitive economic forms, the "village blacksmith gradually replacing the town commission agent and contractor." The villages are being isolated from the towns, thus "intensifying food crises in the latter"; besides this, the constant government requisitions of so-called "surplus grain and other foodstuffs from the peasantry for the purpose of general distribution," leaving a peasant merely an indispensable minimum—in the case of grain, 432 pounds per male per annum—and has resulted in the peasantry's being unable to bring any of their product to town and exchange for such articles as they require. The report declares that Russian "industry is ruined and the country impoverished, and this disaster is so colossal and the contraction of the consuming market so great that caution will be necessary with regard to the forms in which industry may begin its regeneration." It is stated that a necessary condition for economic regeneration of Russia and the restoration of its industry will require millions of dollars of foreign capital.

Mr. President, this report is in harmony with those which we are constantly receiving from Russia, and all demonstrate that any possible trade with Russia for the present is an idle dream. Mr. Jacob H. Rubin, a Milwaukee business man, has recently returned from Russia. I understand that he is testifying to-day before the Foreign Relations Committee. In an interview appearing in this morning's Washington Herald Mr. Rubin states that few Americans realize that there is no Russian Government, that Russian communism is not national but international in scope, that the bolshevik currency bears the legend, translated into English, "United Workmen of all Countries," and that the aim of the communists is the overthrow of all capitalistic forms of government. His statement envisages Russia so clearly that I ask that it may be inserted in the Record as a part of my remarks without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

The interview is as follows:

MILWAUKEE BUSINESS MAN TELLS OF RUSSIAN FLIGHT.

Present chaotic conditions in Russia are eloquent of the failure of communism in that country, according to Jacob H. Rubin, Milwaukee business man, just returned from a visit to Russian cities in the interest of Milwaukee manufacturers.

Rubin, who is registered at the New Willard, had an adventurous career in Russia. Leaving the United States in October, 1919, he reached Russia while Denikine was in power and was arrested as a bolshevik spy December 14, 1919. He was in prison, sentenced to be shot, when the American representative in Bucharest, learning of his plight, notified the State Department, and his release was obtained by Capt. Irvin of the American Red Cross.

OFTEN PUT IN JAIL BY SOVIET LEADERS.

Following the fall of Denikine and under soviet rule, Rubin found traveling in Russia a hazardous undertaking, as he fell into the hands of the soviet authorities several times, but was released after a night or so in jail.

"Russia to-day is absolutely lawless," said Rubin. "In this country and in all countries where liberty is enjoyed under law, existing legislation related to property. Since property rights are not recognized by the soviet government, in Russia there are no laws."

"There is no such thing as a legal contract in Russia," he continued, "no injuries nor liabilities about which to sue or be sued. The only approximation to codified law in Russia to-day is embodied in certain rules of ethics drawn up by the third internationale, the gathering of soviet delegates from all over the world, which convened last July in Odessa."

SAYS NO GOVERNMENT EXISTS IN RUSSIA.

"Few Americans realize," Rubin says, "that at the present time there is no Russian government with which this country may assume diplomatic relations."

"Russian communism is not national; it is not a Russian matter," Rubin explained, "but international in scope. On their currency, for instance, is the legend which translated would read, 'United Workmen of All Countries.' The aim of the communists in all countries is to unite the workmen of the world, and their object is the ultimate overthrow of all capitalistic forms of government."

PEOPLE UNCHANGED SINCE DAYS OF CZAR.

"We must not forget," Rubin said, "that the Russian people of to-day are the same people, with a few changes, who made up the Russia of Czar Nicholas. They have not changed, save for the fact that six years of war reduced the morale of the people, and enforced idleness gave way to bolshevism. Bolshevism is the natural product of idleness. It is not confined to Russia but may be found in any country where men want work but can not secure it. Every man has a right to a job and an opportunity to earn a living."

Asked for a sketch of the soviet government, Rubin explained that Lenin is the president of all the commissariats, as the various departments of the Russian Government are called. These include the various ministries charged with the administration of domestic and foreign affairs and having jurisdiction over such matters as education, food products, all textiles, railroads, sanitation, health, propaganda, and newspapers.

Trotsky has control of the army. There is also an official who corresponds somewhat to a vice president, acting in Lenin's stead.

SAYS SOVIETS HAVE SPLENDID SPY SYSTEM.

"The bolshevik secret service," said Rubin, "is as complete as the Imperial Russian spy system before the war. Lenin has agents in all countries, who vigilantly note every happening which might have bearing upon Russian affairs. No person suspected of having an interest in Russian affairs is immune from this surveillance."

Rubin said that upon his arrival in Moscow and Odessa he found a complete record of his antecedents and activities on file.

SAYS SOVIETS DEAL ONLY IN PROPAGANDA.

"American Congressmen who urge recognition of the Russian Government are deceived into thinking that there is a distinctive Russian Government," said Rubin. "It must be remembered that the various representations being made by the soviet government to this and other Governments are simply propaganda. The soviet leaders believe that recognition may be secured through the indirect influence of commercial agents who come to the United States and other countries ostensibly to promote trade regulations, but in reality to start influences at work calculated to move Congress toward recognizing a soviet régime."

Rubin firmly believes that Russia will one day reach the stage when all factions will realize that after all the best form of government is one such as enjoyed by the people of the United States.

Rubin is well known in Milwaukee business circles, having been connected for many years with the Union Bank of that city. He has been prominent in the Socialist Party, stumping for that organization. He was instrumental in the passage of a usury law in Wisconsin, serving as chairman of the Remedial Loan Association committee. His son, Jacob H. Rubin, is a member of the literary staff of the Milwaukee Journal.

F. W. G.

Mr. KING. Mr. Hector Boon, an American recently returned from Russia, has written a number of articles concerning the Russian situation, one of which appears in the New York Times in its issue of January 13, 1921. In this article he states that he left Moscow on the 10th of October last and proceeded to London. He refers to Americans being held prisoners in Moscow, thus supporting the statement of Mr. Norman Davis, Assistant Secretary of State, that Americans were being "held as hostages by the soviets." Mr. Boon states that his personal business interests are centered in Russia, and that he has everything to gain by resumption of trade, but notwithstanding the benefits that would result, he is "absolutely and uncompromisingly opposed to any trade relations whatsoever with the soviet power. I shall have nothing whatever to do with Russia in so far as trading is concerned while the bolsheviks remain in power. I regard trading with a gang of marauders who now wield power in that country as unsound in theory and practice. The basis of all business is credit, and the basis of credit is reputation. The bolsheviks are thieves. Their word is worthless, and their stock in trade is principally stolen gold, and I decline to become a receiver of stolen property even . . . the instigation of the British Government." His reference to Mr. W. B. Vanderlip, who recently emerged from Siberia with a remarkable story as to his enormous concessions, is exceedingly interesting:

Mr. W. B. Vanderlip told me in Moscow that as soon as Mr. Harding took office the United States would recognize the soviet government, and trading between the States and Russia would be in full swing this coming year.

With all due respect to Mr. Vanderlip and his fantastic contract (which is not worth the paper it is written on), I do not believe that the United States of America will have anything whatever to do with

the soviet government, or that the United States Government will follow the lead of the British Government by entering into an ignoble contract with the biggest bunch of murderers and scoundrels the world has ever seen, or do any act which will tend to increase the power of a gang of marauders whose aim is to smother the truly democratic form of government which obtains in the States, and in the building up and protection of which the sons of America have so gallantly shed their blood in the past.

He refers to Mr. H. G. Wells, the English Socialist, and members of the British Government, and then states:

There are only two classes of people in England who desire that England should trade with the bolsheviks, viz, those manufacturers and merchants who have large stocks of goods on hand which they are unable to dispose of and the direct-action people and their associates. Outside these two classes the people of England are opposed to any dealings with Lenin and company. For those manufacturers and merchants, whether they be English or American, who wish to trade with the bolsheviks, I have nothing but contempt. They are the sort of people who deserted their respective countries during the war, who lost no opportunity of taking advantage of their country's plight, and to-day they are willing to deal with the enemies of mankind, if by so doing they can fill their own pockets.

Speaking of Mr. Wells, he states that he spent but 2 weeks in Petrograd and 30 hours in Moscow, and that he has shown himself remarkably ignorant in relation to many of the vital factors of the Russian situation. Mr. Boon states that labor is conscripted, and that nowhere in the world is the workingman so badly treated as in Russia. Trade-unions have been abolished and the workingman is denied any voice in the Government of his country or the right to strike or protest against his degraded condition. Speaking of the bolshevik régime, he declares it to be a militant minority, comprised principally of the criminal elements, and that Lenin insists that the country should be governed by a dictatorship of strong men who should decide for the people and then enforce their decisions by means of military power.

Mr. M. Schwartz, a well-known American Socialist, and his wife visited Russia, and the former has returned to America. They were imprisoned by the bolsheviks, and his wife endured such hardships while in prison that she died within a short time after arriving in Reval. Speaking of communism, Mr. Schwartz denounces it as—

Robberism; it tolerates imprisonment, persecution, and execution without trial; it has brought Russia starvation, disease, and death. There is no government. It is a worse autocracy than the Czaristic Government, and I lived there for more than 20 years under the Czar and had the experience necessary to make comparisons.

Albert Boni, a member of the publishing house of Boni & Liveright, of New York, recently returned from bolshevik Russia, where he was imprisoned and suffered indignities at the hands of the bolsheviks. In an article appearing in the New York Globe, on January 15, he analyzes the soviet constitution and reveals the manner in which the influence of the peasant in political matters is eliminated. With reference to the claim of the bolsheviks that their government is one controlled by the working classes, Mr. Boni says:

The dictatorship of the workers and peasants, which, according to the communists, is the cornerstone of their whole program, is for Russia a pure myth. Government by the soviets is nonexistent. * * * The Communist Party exercises control over the town, district, and government soviets, controlling such elections as still take place by a system of terror under which only the smallest minority have the courage, under the conditions requiring a public statement of their choice, to vote in opposition. * * * Everyone in Russia who, even though legally and peacefully, does or says anything threatening the party dictatorship of the communists is a counter-revolutionist. Mentally 90 per cent of the Russian people are counter-revolutionary. Only the most stringent suppression of all efforts to lead this common mind to common action holds the Communist Party supreme.

What I have presented should satisfy even the most ardent supporter of bolshevism that there is no possibility of any appreciable commerce between the United States and Russia so long as the present military despotism exists in Russia. Russia has neither gold nor commodities. Commerce between her and other nations is therefore impossible. But, if Americans desire, notwithstanding these conditions, to attempt trade operations, our Government will offer no obstacle. Those desiring to trade may transmit their mail or money through Norway or other countries bordering upon Russia.

The Social Democrat, a newspaper published in Christiania, in its issue of October 29, 1920, states that—

there are no special arrangements with Italy or Czechoslovakia, and yet we trade with those nations—

so Americans may likewise trade with Russia if they can find anything in Russia to buy or any persons to whom they can sell, provided, always, that the soviet will permit. Even if Russia did possess commodities, or the soviet did offer gold or jewelry in exchange for commodities, there would be insuperable objections, at least, to honest men, to Russian trade for the present. A few days ago, in the discussion between the Senator from Maryland and myself, I referred to the recent decision of Judge Roche in Great Britain. It appears that in August, 1920, representatives of the soviets in Great Britain made an agree-

ment with English firms for the sale of Russian timber. They claimed to be agents of the soviet, of the people's commissaries; they did not deal as individuals or represent the owners of the timber. They contended, of course, that the timber belonged to the soviet government, and as its representatives they entered into the agreement. The timber was shipped to England, and there attached by agents of a Russian firm, which had a branch in England. It was alleged that the soviets had confiscated the property in 1918.

The English firms claiming title under the soviet government contended that the presence of the soviet trade commission and its negotiation with the foreign office constituted a practical recognition of the soviet government as a de facto government, and that its title to the property which it pretended to sell could not be attacked. In overruling the defendants' contention Judge Roche held that Great Britain had never recognized the soviet government, and it, therefore, had no legal status. It was held that the confiscatory act of the soviets gave it no title. A perusal of the decision of Judge Roche suggests the inquiry as to what his decision would have been if Great Britain had accorded recognition to the bolshevik dictatorship. Undoubtedly, such recognition would have given those who purchased from the soviet government a stronger position in court.

But, in my opinion, the communist régime is principally interested in securing recognition in order that it may be free to send its emissaries to other nations to conduct communist propaganda for the destruction of society. Doubtless it desires recognition in order that it may find a possible market for limited quantities of property which it has confiscated. I referred to the fact that there were thousands of business men, not Russians, who had large investments in Russia. Their property has been confiscated; and if there were any trade between the United States and Russia it is quite likely that some of this confiscated property would be tendered by the soviets in payment for American commodities. It would be an immoral act for any person to receive such stolen property in exchange for commodities delivered by them to the soviet government. If the soviet government should pretend to deliver to business firms of Great Britain property belonging to Americans which the soviets had seized, I have no doubt but what our Government would protest against the transaction and would aid, through its diplomatic channels, the American owner to recover possession. If the Mexican Government should confiscate all property within its territory, including that of Americans and other foreigners, and should attempt to dispose of property owned by Americans to the nationals of other countries, we would insist that the transaction was invalid, and the purchasers from the Mexican Government would be called upon to defend their title to the property in the courts of civilized nations.

In the spring of 1920 there was a small quantity of flax stored at Reval, which was offered for sale by the bolsheviks and purchased by the British Government. Later the bolsheviks attempted to dispose of it to others, and the British representative at the San Remo Economic Council, May 22, 1920, gave notice that the property had been bought and paid for by Great Britain.

I mentioned that efforts had been made by Germany to trade with Russia, but that the results were unsatisfactory. At a meeting of a German business organization—Deutscher Ost-Europäischer Wirtschaftsverband—on June 26, 1920, at Elberfeld, Germany, the possibility of trading with Russia was considered. The manager of the society, Mr. Meyer, stated:

We have negotiated with the representatives of the soviet government in Berlin and Copenhagen since 1919, but they have always tried, and failed, to fool us. They demanded offers of goods, promised a great deal, but as yet have done nothing. They have always found some excuse for not abiding by their word. I do not think it will be possible for private firms to trade with Russia in the near future.

In September, 1920, Mr. Mjelde, a representative of the Norwegian Government, declared that the Lenin régime and its representative, Litvinov, were not sincere in their commercial negotiations but were hiding their political efforts and seeking recognition for propaganda purposes. He further said:

Mr. Litvinov's proposals are considered impossible from a commercial point of view, and in addition he has made them dependent upon conditions that would practically involve political recognition by Norway of soviet Russia.

At a meeting of the supreme economic council of the league, held July 26, 1920, a statement was filed that certain timber offered for sale by the soviet government belonged to a Norwegian firm. Proof of ownership was submitted and notice given that—

All necessary steps would be taken to protect the claim of the Norwegian owner.

An important conclusion was reached by the Government participating in the supreme economic council, namely: The regulations which would be established with respect to goods

hitherto delivered to British merchants and at present seized by the bolsheviks will be extended fully to foreign traders. As I interpret this rule, it means that Great Britain will apply the rule announced by Judge Roche to all controversies, even though the claimants are not British subjects. That would mean that any property confiscated by the bolsheviks and sold by them could be recovered against the title of the soviets in any English court. In other words, the soviets have no title to stolen property, and those who purchase it can not successfully maintain their claim to ownership if the true owner invokes the jurisdiction of the English courts.

On the 11th of October, 1920, the Department of State gave out a statement concerning trade in Russia. It was carefully prepared by agents of the State Department in the Baltic Provinces. It states that of the entire amount of Russia's foreign commerce across the Esthonian border during five months—that is, from April to September, 1920—25,000 tons reached Russia, of which 18,000 tons were foodstuffs and the remainder chemicals, drugs, paper, metal goods, and engine parts.

In the matter of exports, the balance of trade is entirely against the soviet government, the only items of export consisting of small quantities of hemp and veneer wood. However, regret is expressed by the soviets that military necessity deters them from giving more attention to this growing trade.

The State Department further reports that the exports from Russia are practically infinitesimal, the two leading products being flax and timber, and these consist of old stocks existing prior to the bolshevik coup d'état. Let me add that these stocks were owned by Russian business firms and by foreigners who were engaged in business in Russia prior to the bolshevik régime, which confiscated them.

The amounts of export, however, are so small as to preclude any basis for a barter trade.

I have made as thorough an examination as possible of the available sources of information and find that the greater part of the very small importations by Russia consists of military supplies and potatoes and food products from the Baltic Provinces which were a part of Russia.

Mr. President, any extensive trade between the soviet power and civilized nations is impossible. As I have repeatedly indicated, this Nation and other nations are willing to sell to the people of Russia and would be glad if the latter had any means of paying for the same, but the economic conditions of Russia prevent production, and domestic as well as foreign commerce. The soviet dictatorship desires to be recognized as a government in order that it may, under the protection of treaties and international law, place its ambassadors, ministers, diplomats, consular representatives, and other agents in the important countries of the world, where under the immunity and protection guaranteed them, they might carry on bolshevik propaganda for the destruction of civilization.

A soviet wireless under date of September 10 defines the situation as follows:

The only thing that the Russian Government demands is that de facto relations be resumed, as it is obvious that otherwise trade relations are impossible; therefore such resumption of de facto relations is inseparable from trade relations.

The meaning of this statement is unmistakable. The soviets are more interested in being accorded recognition than in trade; but they announce that there will be no trade with Russia without recognition of the soviet power.

A world-wide drive is now being conducted by the soviets and their sympathizers and abettors in all parts of the world for recognition. We have been unwilling to treat with this outlaw organization and accord to it a position among the civilized nations of the world. Mr. W. C. Huntington, who was in Russia during a portion of the bolshevik régime as a representative of the Government of the United States, in an article in Scribner's Magazine for July, 1919, states:

Recently the bolshevik or so-called soviet government has been seeking commercial connections with the world. Immoral in principle and an economic failure in practice, this group, as was stated earlier, has capacity and desire only to propagandize, not to construct. Substantial concerns will scarcely be attracted by the proposals of this group, which denies the ethical principles of commerce and which has ruined the business men of its own country. Such a government can not have commerce.

The Senator from Maryland in his resolution, to which I have frequently referred, asks that the—

President be, and he is hereby, advised to communicate at once, through the Department of State, with the Government of Russia—

And so forth.

If this resolution were to be adopted it would be construed as a recognition by the Senate of the existence of the soviet government of Russia. Do the American people desire to give recognition, de facto or de jure, to the bolshevik dictatorship?

Recognition is the assurance given to a new State that it will be permitted to hold its place and rank in the character of an independent political organism in the society of nations. If recognition were accorded Lenin's despotism, it would be retroactive and validate its crimes, usurpations, and robbery. Its acts of spoliation, rapine, and murder could not be challenged in our courts. Acts under which it claims title to all Russian property, real and personal, would be free from legalistic attack, although we would know that property which it might seek to export was owned and claimed by private persons or corporations—some of whom are nationals of other countries, including America—the possession of which by force and violence the soviet power had acquired, and title to which it asserts. Our courts could not sit in judgment on the acts of such government, and its hideous wrongs would be approved and its power strengthened.

I should like to discuss the international and legal questions involved in according recognition, de facto or de jure, or both, to new States or powers, but shall not do so at this time. I will only add that though there has been animated discussion for a century as to the rightful authority to accord such recognition, I believe that precedent and practice in our country supports the view that the power to recognize new States rests with the Executive, or possibly with the President in conjunction with the Senate.

Prof. Willoughby declares that recognition is an act to be performed by the President. He adds:

It is to be presumed, however, that when the recognition of a status of belligerency or of the independence of a revolutionary government is likely to constitute a casus belli with some other foreign power, the President will be guided in large measure by the wishes of the legislative branch. Upon the other hand, it is the proper province of the Executive to refuse to be guided by a resolution on the part of the legislature if, in his judgment, to do so would be unwise. The legislature may express its wishes or opinions, but may not command.

On the 20th of December I offered a resolution, which is now before the Committee on Foreign Relations, in which I stated some reasons against recognizing the soviet dictatorship. There has been nothing in its conduct since then which would lead to a modification of the position there taken.

It will be observed that I do not express disapproval of trade between the nationals of this country and Europe, and I hope I have made it clear that I am offering no objections whatever to Americans entering into agreements with the people of Russia for an exchange of commodities or for any form of purchase and sale between them. Without reading, I ask that the resolution which I offered be inserted in the Record as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no objections. It is so ordered.

Whereas the so-called soviet socialist dictatorship in Russia pretends to be the successor of the former legal and recognized Government of Russia and is seeking political and diplomatic recognition from the Government of the United States; and

Whereas said soviet Russia dictatorship has repudiated the acknowledged and legal obligations of the former Government of Russia to other Governments and to the nationals of other Governments with whom it was in contract relations; and

Whereas said soviet socialist dictatorship has ignored and refuses to recognize the duties and obligations of nations under international law, including the obligation of honor and good faith in the keeping and performance of international treaties; and

Whereas the professions and acts of said soviet socialist dictatorship in Russia are incompatible with the principles of public order and the liberty, rights, and property of individuals as established in the law of all civilized States; and

Whereas said soviet socialist dictatorship has carried on a propaganda in the United States for the destruction of public order and private rights, which propaganda is inimical to the interests of the United States and constitutes an offense against the Government and people of the United States; and

Whereas said soviet socialist dictatorship acknowledges no common ground of international law or honor to sustain political and diplomatic relations between the Government of the United States and said soviet socialist dictatorship pretending to be the Government of Russia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States do not recognize the present soviet socialist dictatorship in Russia as either a de facto or de jure government, and that the Government of the United States do not enter into political or diplomatic relations with said dictatorship or with any persons claiming authority under the same.

Mr. KING. I referred to a letter of Secretary Colby addressed to the ambassador of Italy August 10, 1920. Concerning the question of recognizing the communist power, he says:

With the desire of the allied powers to bring about a peaceful solution of the existing difficulties in Europe, this Government is, of course, in hearty accord and will support any justifiable steps to that end. It is unable to perceive, however, that a recognition of the soviet régime would promote, much less accomplish, this object, and it is, therefore, averse to any dealings with the soviet régime beyond the most narrow boundaries to which a discussion of an armistice can be confined.

That the present rulers of Russia do not rule by the will or the consent of any considerable proportion of the Russian people is an incontestable fact. Although nearly two and a half years have passed since they seized the machinery of government, promising to protect the constituent assembly against alleged conspiracies against it, they have not yet permitted anything in the nature of a popular election.

At the moment when the work of creating a popular representative government based upon universal suffrage was nearing completion the bolsheviks, although in number an inconsiderable minority of the people, by force and cunning seized the powers and machinery of government and have continued to use them with savage oppression to maintain themselves in power.

The Secretary further states:

It is not possible for the Government of the United States to recognize the present rulers of Russia as a government with which the relations common to friendly Governments can be maintained. This conviction has nothing to do with any particular political or social structure which the Russian people themselves may see fit to embrace. It rests upon a wholly different set of facts.

The Secretary in a few striking sentences shows what bolshevism is and why there can be no friendly relations between civilized nations and bolsheviks. He states:

These facts, which none dispute, have convinced the Government of the United States, against its will, that the existing régime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor or good faith and every usage and convention underlying the whole structure of international law; the negation, in short, of every principle upon which it is possible to base harmonious and trustful relations, whether of nations or of individuals. The responsible leaders of the régime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements. This attitude of disregard of obligations voluntarily entered into by them based upon the theory that no compact or agreement made with a nonbolshevik government can have any moral force for them. They have not only avowed this as a doctrine, but have exemplified it in practice. Indeed, upon numerous occasions the responsible spokesmen of this power and its official agencies have declared that it is their understanding that the very existence of bolshevism in Russia, the maintenance of their own rule, depends, and must continue to depend, upon the occurrence of revolutions in all other great civilized nations, including the United States, which will overthrow and destroy their Governments and set up bolshevik rule in their stead. They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries.

Speaking of assurances that might be given not to abuse the privileges and immunities accorded to diplomatic agents, the Secretary states that such can not be seriously regarded:

That it is within the knowledge of the United States that the bolshevik régime is itself subject to the control of a political faction, with extensive international ramifications through the third internationale, and that this body, which is heavily subsidized by the bolshevik government from the public revenues of Russia, has for its openly avowed aim the promotion of bolshevik revolutions throughout the world. The leaders of the bolsheviks have boasted that their promises of non-interference with other nations would in no wise bind the agents of this body. There is no room for reasonable doubt that such agents would receive the support and protection of any diplomatic agencies the bolsheviks might have in other countries. Inevitably, therefore, the diplomatic service of the bolshevik government would become a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt against the institutions and laws of countries with which it was at peace, which would be an abuse of friendship to which enlightened Governments can not subject themselves.

This great State paper then declares that there can be no common ground upon which our Government can stand with a power—

whose conceptions of international relations are so entirely alien to its own, so utterly repugnant to its moral sense. We can not recognize, hold official relations with, or give friendly reception to the agents of a government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions; whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt; whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them.

Mr. President, no one can controvert this position taken by the able Secretary of State, and I can not comprehend how any American, in the light of all the facts, could desire that our Government should recognize the bolshevik power, so long as it supports the immoral and destructive policies for which it now stands and devotes its efforts to the overthrow of the United States and all other civilized Governments. We are dealing with a concrete matter—with a brutal and barbarous force, not with some theory which may transform it in the future.

It is known that nearly all nations into which bolshevik representatives were admitted were compelled to order their expulsion from their borders. Only yesterday there appeared a dispatch from Copenhagen in the New York Times, to the effect that the arrested terrorists at Kovno planned to murder the officials of the Lithuanian Government. They were closely associated with the Russian soviet representative, Axelrod, who attempted to overthrow this Government which the soviets had recognized. "The expulsion," the dispatch states, "of the soviet representative has been demanded."

After recognizing the Lithuanian Government and agreeing by solemn treaty to respect its integrity, the soviet power attempted to destroy it, and, by assassination, place communists in power.

When we remember the aim of Lenin and his associates—that of destroying all nations—we can readily perceive the cause of their anxiety to secure international recognition. Lenin, in October, 1920, stated that he regarded the Russian revolution not as an end in itself—

but as a first step in a world revolution. The question is, How are we to promote a proletarian revolution in western Europe? France is our greatest enemy, for all her strength is being used to stabilize things in Europe.

He further stated when negotiations were pending concerning the proposed Prinko conference:

I have never hesitated to come to terms with bourgeois governments when by so doing I thought I could weaken the bourgeoisie.

Zinoviev, one of the most powerful of the communists, declared that—

We are willing to sign an unfavorable peace with the Allies. It would only mean that we should put no trust whatever in the bit of paper we should sign.

It is known that when the supreme economic council of the League of Nations consented on January 16, 1920, to resume trade with Russia, the soviet power refused to permit trade, insisting upon recognition as a *sine qua non*.

The bolsheviks on the 27th of August, 1918, covenanted not to indulge in any agitations against the State and military activities of Germany, but this solemn engagement did not deter them from attempting the overthrow of the German Republic. Millions of rubles were expended in propaganda, and bolshevik agents were active in the German States, seeking to precipitate a revolution. This fact was admitted by Tchitcherin in a note to the German Government, as shown by the bolshevik organ, the *Izvestia*, under date of December 26, 1918.

Germany was compelled to expel the bolshevik minister, Joffe, who after his expulsion confessed that the Russian Government as a whole and its accredited representatives in Berlin "never concealed the fact that they were not observing this article," meaning the covenant to abstain from propaganda, "and did not intend to do so."

The Prussian Government was compelled to expel Zinoviev and his companion, who obtained permission to visit Germany to attend a socialist congress; and, violating the pledges given, they immediately began to intrigue against the German Government. Dr. Simons, the foreign minister of Germany, in ordering the expulsion, stated, "There was no other course open."

Every nation which has admitted representatives of the bolsheviks has been compelled in self-defense to drive them from their borders. Bolshevik representatives went to Great Britain apparently eager to negotiate trade agreements. Litvinoff took advantage of his opportunities and endeavored to precipitate a revolution in England. The British Government later refused, after his expulsion, to receive him, and Kamenev was sent in his stead, and he, in violation of the pledges given to abstain from propaganda and revolutionary activities, attempted to corrupt labor, subsidize newspapers, and overthrow the Government.

Switzerland acknowledged the Kerensky provisional government and, as I remember, received its ambassador. When the bolshevik came to power Switzerland received their representatives, but owing to their revolutionary activities they were within a few months expelled from Switzerland. Norway, Sweden, and Denmark received bolshevik representatives, but there, as elsewhere, their conduct was contrary to all international usage; they engaged in intrigues and plots and revolutionary movements, and each Government was compelled to drive them from its territory.

With an organization believing in no law, recognizing no international obligations, seeking the destruction of nations everywhere, denying the sacredness of covenants and the obligations of treaties, refusing to recognize any of the principles of morality or justice upon which society and human government is founded, it is manifest this nation can have no political relations. The bolshevik régime is our sworn enemy, and no treaty obligation and nothing which we could do would prevent its emissaries from actively engaging in intrigues and revolutionary movements for the dislocation of our economic and industrial life and the final overthrow of the Republic.

The principal effect of recognition, as between States, relates to the status of the recognized State in international law, which affects the relations of States as distinguished from relations between individuals, or relations touching individuals. It is presumed, however, that a State which is recognized by other States as an independent nation has a government which is based upon the principles of morality and justice which are universally recognized. The property of persons within any State is subject to the law and legal process of such State, and the comity of nations requires that the legality of the political and judicial acts of any State, with respect to its own nationals and property within its jurisdiction, shall be recognized by other States. The Government of the United States can therefore have no proper concern as to the property of Russian nationals within the territory of Russia, especially if the United States recognizes the so-called soviet Government. The only

proper and safe course for the United States to take is to declare that when in Russia a government is established which protects the liberty and property of the persons subject to its jurisdiction in harmony with the principles of law and morality obtaining generally in the countries with which the United States has diplomatic and political relations, it will accord recognition to the same, but until then it will refuse to recognize any authority or government which fails to meet those requirements.

As before remarked, the recognition by this Government of the bolshevik authority would be to accord to it on the part of the United States the rights of an independent sovereign government, together with a respect for its dignity and the validity of its legislative and political acts which is generally accorded civilized nations in their international relations. We would be estopped and precluded from denying the soviets the authority and respect accorded other nations, and from denying the title to property which by soviet regulations was declared to be the property of the State. Such property would pass in international commerce, notwithstanding it had been stolen from the Russian people and the nationals of other countries who had investments in Russia. All nations which recognize the soviets would be precluded from bringing any question regarding the legal possession of property of the soviet in such articles of commerce. If our Government should decide to trade with thieves and outlaws, who by assassination and military force asserted temporary authority, on terms of equality and recognition, of course, it could not deny the title to property or commodities it might obtain in such transactions.

It has been said that the soviet régime is built upon the destruction of all social values created by civilization in the domain of religion, morality, and economic integrity. Masquerading under the name of a "government," it is simply a system of plunder and utter disregard of the rights of individuals.

Mr. President, we shall welcome the regeneration of Russia. The Russian people occupy an important place in the economic, as well as in the political life of the world. We recognize how important it is to have world peace, and for the unimpeded flow of the currents of the world's economic life, that Russia should have peace and order and that her teeming millions should have freedom and prosperity. The gains in the Great War will not be finally consolidated until Russia takes her place among the free and enlightened nations of the world. The full liquidation of the war will be postponed until Russia emerges from her long night of darkness. But the days of her travail will end, and she will join the marching forces of liberty and justice in that majestic procession which carries forever forward all that is worthy of survival in life.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] yesterday announced that he would address the Senate on the pending measure to-day. It is not my intention to take any of the time of the Senator from Colorado, but I would like to read a telegram I have just received from the secretary of state of the State of Nevada, addressed to me under date of January 20, and reading as follows:

CARSON, NEV., January 20, 1921.

Hon. CHARLES E. HENDERSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Senate joint resolution No. 4, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of the Fordney emergency tariff bill:

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States a measure known as the Fordney emergency tariff bill; and
Whereas under the terms and provisions of said measure the various industries of Nevada are directly and vitally affected and the passage of the said bill will greatly benefit the people of the State of Nevada; and

Whereas the said emergency bill will directly benefit all the agricultural and live-stock interests of this country and prevent the threatened collapse and demoralization of these industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), The Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized and requested to pass the Fordney emergency tariff bill: And be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the State of Nevada by telegraph to each of our Senators and to our Representatives in Congress with the request that they secure immediate favorable action upon the said Fordney emergency tariff bill now pending before the Congress of the United States.

GEORGE BRODIGAN,
Secretary of State.

Mr. President, after the Senators who intend to address themselves to the measure have concluded, I sincerely trust that we may secure a vote upon the pending so-called Fordney emergency tariff bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, may I in this same connection read a telegram, along similar lines, from Mr. J. G. Smith, of Fort Worth, Tex., one of the most prominent citizens and business men of that section of the State, in fact, of the entire State? It reads as follows:

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The long delay in passing the emergency tariff bill now before the Senate is giving speculators every opportunity to depress prices of southern and southwestern farm products to such low points as to drive terror into the hearts and minds of the producers, dealers, and bankers. Many are already bankrupt, others are nearing bankruptcy, and many are committing desperate deeds never before contemplated. General situation, Southwest and West, daily grows worse pending action on emergency tariff legislation.

JULIE G. SMITH.

Mr. President, in face of such a situation I do not see how the Senate can defer favorable action upon an emergency measure of this kind, which, in my judgment, does not involve any question of a permanent tariff policy or of party alignment.

[Mr. THOMAS addressed the Senate, and after having spoken for nearly three hours yielded the floor for the day.]

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina addressed the Senate. After having spoken for nearly an hour,

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me that I may submit a report from the Committee on Military Affairs upon a number of executive nominations?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

CONFIRMATION OF MILITARY NOMINATIONS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent, as in open executive session, to make a favorable report from the Committee on Military Affairs carrying recommendations for the confirmation of some 5,000 original appointments in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEFLIN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, those appointments are confirmed by that action. I was going to ask unanimous consent that they be confirmed without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The unanimous consent, I understand, embraces the confirmation of the list without reading, and that the President shall be notified.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, the nominations will be confirmed, and the President will be notified.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have another request of the same nature to make for unanimous consent as in open executive session. It has to do with the names of four appointees whose nominations were sent to the Senate after January 18, which was the day the Senate ordered reference to the committee of the 5,000. These four are in exactly the same category. They are original appointments, and I therefore ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of these four nominations without reference to the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It seems to me that is absolutely fair. The other original appointments were confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WADSWORTH. These are of the same nature.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. These appointments merely came in a day or two later than the reference, and I think they ought to have the same treatment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I assume that all these nominations have the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; there was one vote in opposition.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We have very few Senators here. Does the Senator know whether that Senator would be opposed to the consideration of the nominations?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? In the absence of objection, the nominations will be confirmed, and the President will be notified.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Again, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in open executive session, for the present consideration of the nomination of Second Lieut. Edward Hamilton Young to be a first lieutenant. This is not an original appointment; but on June 2, 1920, Edwin H. Young was nominated and was confirmed by the Senate for the office of first lieutenant. This nomination is sent to correct an error in the name only. The name should be Edward Hamilton Young, instead of Edwin Hamilton Young; and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that nomination as in open executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, does that interfere with the speech of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does not. Without objection, the nomination will be confirmed, and the President will be notified. The Senate in legislative session resumes the consideration of the unfinished business.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have not taken any part in this debate, not because there are not features of the bill which are calculated to give relief to some of the distressed agricultural people of this country, but one reason I deplore the fact that this character of legislation is proposed at this time is that I believe the people of the country at large have an acute realization of the real cause of the present condition.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who has just yielded the floor, has on other occasions than the one this afternoon called attention to the fact that the collapse of prices was inevitable. The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, I believe that no such condition as that in which the farmers now find themselves was inevitable.

Prior to the outbreak of the war we had passed certain financial legislation, known as the Federal reserve act, which, it was the proud boast of the Democratic Party of this country, was so constructed and was so elastic as to meet any emergency which might arise in the country calling for financing.

That law went into operation about 1914. Before the country had become accustomed to its operation, and certainly before even those who were instrumental in its passage had become familiar with the practical workings of its provisions, there came a test as to its practicability which forever put it beyond the doubt of anyone that, so far as this country was concerned, we had solved the problem of an adequate, elastic currency to meet any conditions in this country. We had changed the basis of credit and placed the basis of credit upon the production of wealth in this country, so that we hoped that we had reversed the ridiculous procedure that had characterized the production in this country up until the passage of this act, which was that when we made a big agricultural crop the agricultural producers were brought to the verge of starvation, while when we made a small agricultural crop they were comparatively prosperous.

The reason of that was because the amount of currency was fixed and rigid, and therefore the price that was to be paid for any given commodity was not dependent upon the demand for that commodity but was dependent upon how much currency there was available for the movement of that commodity. In the passage of the Federal reserve act we therefore had changed that condition and made it possible that the larger the crop, if the law of supply and demand operated, the greater the volume of currency, without a diminution in price, and the greater the profit to those who produced it.

That was one feature of the measure. The other feature was that we made it possible for the first time in the history of national banking in this country for the agricultural interests of this country to be put on an equal footing with manufacturing business or with ordinary commercial business.

Not only did we do that, but we recognized the peculiar nature of agriculture as contrasted with other business of the country—artificial production, which was manufacturing and commerce. We recognized the difference, and I wrote at my own desk the modification of and the proviso to section 13, which recognized the slow turnover in the capital of the farmer, and provided for six months' discount, as against 90 days in commercial paper, and had it put through this body, in order to meet the very condition which now confronts us, namely, that when the farmer had produced at the end of 12 months an aggregate supply to be used in the next 12 months he should not be forced, by virtue of the obligations incurred during the producing 12 months, to put a 12 months' supply on the market in 30 to 60 days, thereby breaking the market and ruining it. I provided 6 months' time during which he might use the thing he produced as collateral security in order to enable him to distribute that which he had produced over 12 months and not be forced to glut the market with the very thing he had produced. Not only that, but we made special provision that the Federal Reserve Board should grant to him certain privileges, in their discretion, when necessity demanded it, which were not extended to others.

In the winter of 1919 a cry went from one side of this country to the other that the nations of Europe, war ridden, decimated, and impoverished, had to be fed, and that America, on account of the position she occupied during the war, had become the pool into which had flowed the gold of the world, and that, so far as wealth and riches might be measured by dollars and cents, she was the banker of the universe, and that the other nations of

the earth, being in a position where they could not produce sufficient to supply themselves, and we being in a position to till every acre and make our fields and forests and mines respond to the needs of the world, we must supply them with what they needed, and the farmers heeded the behest and produced perhaps the greatest crop ever produced in the history of this country. And what was the result?

Every article that he bought in the production of the crop was bought at the beginning of the year, of course, because then is when he assumes his obligations. The part that man plays in producing a natural crop is in preparing the soil, preparing the seed bed, and planting the seed. Nature practically does the balance. He responded to the call, produced this great crop, assumed obligations that he must meet, and then, without rime or reason, between the time that the crop was planted and the harvest time, when the wheat of the West and the cotton of the South were in the process of maturing, there came a cry, taken up and carried by all the newspapers of the country to the four corners of America, that we must deflate, we must contract. What was the result? Prices began to break, continued to break, as a result of two things alone. One was the universality of the propaganda and the other was the Federal reserve law, which placed in the hands of seven men the financial and commercial destiny of America. I challenge any man to read the Federal reserve law and answer successfully to the contrary the statement that every bank in America, State and National, is in the hands of the seven members of the board of governors at the other end of the Avenue. Of course, when we passed the law we had to give certain discretionary powers to those gentlemen, but it was never dreamed that they would use that power to precipitate the very thing that we had passed the law to obviate.

Let me put a proposition to the Senate this afternoon. Every business man has to depend upon credit, I do not care what his capital is. The major part of the business of the country is done upon the basis of credit. In the early spring and summer of 1920 every newspaper was filled with the propaganda that credit must be restricted, currency deflated, and a general contraction had; and, in addition to that, there were weekly and daily utterances from the Secretary of the Treasury and the chairman of the board of governors telling of the fact that credits would be withheld and were going to be withheld, and regardless of whether the gold reserve demanded by the law was sufficient to warrant more extended credit, regardless of the fact that there was a foreign demand based, of course, upon credit for collateral we might take in exchange for the temporary use of our Federal reserve notes. What business man would have dared go on, being dependent upon his member bank for accommodations sufficient to carry on his business, when he knew the policy of those in the hollow of whose hands the wherewithal to do the business was such as to break him overnight? What was the result? The result was that every business man began to cancel contracts, began to refuse to make contracts, and to destroy the American market.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] said here this afternoon that there was a collapse in Japan. Why should there not have been a collapse in Japan? Why should there not be great distress in the war-ridden zone as well as in those countries which participated in the war, when the sale of certain products depended upon America's power to purchase, and America's power to purchase had been destroyed by America's own officers in charge of her financial affairs?

How could the silk of Japan be bought when the cotton and the wool of America was destroyed? Of course Japan's bank collapsed.

The Senator from Colorado said it was world-wide. A close study of the avenues of trade will show that the distress that is now prevalent comes from two sources—one, those whose actual property was destroyed by war, and the other those who were looking to America for trade in exchange for the kind of collateral that they could give and which trade was ruthlessly destroyed by our own official action.

I had hoped that we would have addressed ourselves to the recognition of the real cause of this collapse and heroically and bravely have met it and placed the responsibility where it belonged and branded for all time the men who, either ignorantly or worse, brought it about. It was our duty to have done that thing.

There is not a man here who would pretend to say that the measure before us is going to give or can give the relief to agriculture that it stands so sorely in need of. I said in a colloquy that I had with the Senator from Colorado this afternoon that doubtless there are some things produced in the country, the volume of which is so inadequate to meet the demands of the country that there may be some measure of relief

to the farmers who produce them, but as to the great mass of agricultural products, those who have made a careful study of the provisions of the bill know that it is practically impossible for any relief whatever to be given.

We might as well face one fact, and that is that the agricultural interests of the country have got to be recognized as the peculiar nature of their business demands that they shall be recognized, and that every provision within the legitimate scope of law shall be made to meet that peculiar condition and prevent the disaster that is sure to come to this country unless such action is taken.

What does the cry for the lowering of the high cost of living mean in its last analysis? Take the last census, and what did it reveal? It showed that the urban population of the country had increased, while the rural or agricultural population had decreased. Therefore the demand for bread and meat in the country was more intensified than before. The people who walk the streets and get a stated salary as a matter of course are interested in increasing the purchasing power of the dollar, while the man who produces the food and clothing of the country is dependent upon the purchasing power of the thing he produces.

The cry for the reduction of the high cost of living means in its basic and fundamental significance the lowering of the prices of raw material. The production of food and raiment are fundamentally and basically important, and the cry is to put down the cost at the source of production, without regard to the effect upon the producer, in order that the urban population might dwell in the white light and enjoy the blessing of a congested but organized community. It was pointed out just a few weeks ago by the staid, old conservative journal, the greatest child paper of America, the *Youth's Companion*, that unless we provide some means by which the farmer could have carpets on his floor and pictures on his walls, electric lights and water-works and the modern conveniences that bless the man of the city we would doom American agriculture to the class of serfdom and make the support of the great urban population questionable and the stability and prosperity of our country impossible.

What word is being spoken here now, what legislation is being proposed now to aid the agriculturists of the country who, on the threshold of the new crop, find themselves bankrupt, with credit and capital gone, and the American people and the world waiting on the product of 1921?

What do Senators hear from their own panic-stricken States and from the State banks? What is being done there to insure the farmer any hope? Why should he hope, when under the merciless grip of those who have our financial affairs in hand he was put into the category of those who were in a position to "help themselves," and was stripped of a lifetime's earnings? Many a farmer to-day who by an economy that was absolutely cruel had stored up a pittance against old age and inability to earn has seen his small hoardings swept away forever, because some men thought that we had given them the power to determine prices and to fix the wages of 105,000,000 American people. I repeat, what provision is being made for the farmer now? The spring of 1921 is upon us. What encouragement is there for the farmer to look to the future, after his bitter experience of the present?

Now we come to the pending proposition—the emergency tariff measure. Mr. President, I shall have something to say about what would be the result if the proposed law should be applied as it is intended to be applied, but I desire first to ask, Does not every Senator here know that it is a fact as to every farmer who has produced a bushel of wheat or a pound of cotton, or who has produced beef on the hoof, the cattle raisers of this country, that not one of them ever fixed the price of a bushel of wheat or a pound of cotton or a head of cattle?

If we give the meat packers of this country a monopoly of the purchase, storage, and sale of meat products, we may build our tariff wall to the heavens, but the men who raise the cattle, the producers, will receive no benefit. They are not and can not be organized as are those who buy their products, and so the purchasers will fix the price according to the profits which they desire. If that necessitates the trimming to the bone of those who produce the cattle, the purchasers will trim them. The same thing is especially true as to the wheat and cotton producers.

Suppose we only raised enough cotton in this country to supply the American demand. The producers are now scattered over a vast domain representing every degree of financial circumstances from those who have nothing to those who are in what we may call comparatively easy circumstances. The merchant and the banker in the last analysis are as much producers

of cotton as are the men who work in the fields, in that they furnish the money to produce it; but they are only concerned in getting enough money out to repay the loan which they have made to the producer and the interest on it. If there is anything left over the tenant farmer may have it, and if there is not it is no concern of the banker. Therefore there can be no organization amongst them. Then, what is the result? It is that the mill people who have the power to fix the price of the article which is manufactured out of cotton can, as they do now, fix the price of the cotton, barring the speculation on our exchanges. If the proposed tariff law contained some provision to the effect that after its passage, if there were a duty of 20 cents a bushel fixed on wheat, a penalty would be imposed on the man who should offer the farmer any price less than one which would enable him to receive the benefit of tariff there might be some reason for the enactment of the bill; though I do not know whether or not some of us would be willing to accept it even in that form as being the proper kind of legislation.

I have always thought that when Senators and Representatives stood in the Halls of Congress and complained of the competition of foreign labor with American labor and contended that the tariff duty should measure the difference between the cost of foreign production and the cost of domestic production, they recognized, perhaps, what labor was asking for, but made no provision that the man whom we have declared was to be the beneficiary of the legislation should get that difference.

Take cotton manufacturing, woolen manufacturing, and steel manufacturing. We have provided in tariff legislation as to those who engaged in steel manufacture in this country that their employees, their laborers, should be entitled to enjoy an American condition of living as compared to that of the foreigner. We have passed such tariff laws, but we have made no provision that the difference incident to the imposition of the tariff should inure directly and specifically to the benefit of the employees; we have left it to the sweet will of the manufacturer as to what part, if any, of that difference he would give to labor; so that the first beneficiary was the employer, and the second beneficiary was the employee, if he was benefited at all. I think the history of certain strikes in this country has demonstrated the fact that the melon has been cut, not for the benefit of those engaged as laborers in the production of the commodity, but for the benefit of those who owned the plant. So I maintain this afternoon that in considering the pending emergency tariff bill we should go the whole length and provide that whatever duty is imposed upon a commodity shall be reflected in the price of the American article and not be left to the caprice of those who buy and sell the American article as to whether, protected by the duty, they will then attempt to beat down the price to the American producer, and being protected themselves, give no protection to the man who produces.

I hear some clamor from some of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber to the effect that they desire a duty on oil in order to raise the price of cotton seed. What guaranty has anyone that in the market for cottonseed oil the buyers of the cotton seed are going to allow the measure of protection that is granted to them to be enjoyed by those who produce the seed? How does anyone know as to that? What guaranty has anyone from the history of the past that the amount of the duty will be the measure of the difference in price which will be extended to the people who produce the commodity?

Mr. President, I am not going to pretend to say or pretend to deny that perhaps there will be a measure of relief accorded to certain agricultural interests; but the bill can not in the very nature of things benefit the rank and file of those who produce crops of sufficient volume to afford a surplus for export.

The price of the short-staple cotton of the South and of the wheat crop of the West is fixed in the European market where the surplus is sold. The tariff wall may be put as high as the sky, but the surplus sold abroad will measure the price of the domestic product. That is necessarily so; there is no escape from it. If the producers of wheat and the producers of cotton had the power to organize and to fix their own prices, then it would not especially affect the domestic price even if a wall were put around this country high enough to keep out the similar products of any other nation, although I think that if the producers of cotton and wheat could so organize themselves as to fix the price of the commodity which they produce, and then we were to put a tariff on that commodity, they could get an enhanced price in America measured by the tariff, and then do as the steel people did, sell higher to the American and cheaper to the foreigner.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, has the Senator from South Carolina thought of this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEFLIN in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Suppose that the Congress of the United States were to fix a duty which amounted to an embargo so that there should be no importations of wheat or cotton from abroad, and then the American farmer foolishly raised more wheat and more cotton than the American people needed, would not the result of this legislation be absolutely disastrous, because they could not even get rid of the surplus at a small margin of profit, but would be compelled to sell the entire product to the home market for whatever they could get?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly. The principle involved is this: Had the farmer the power to regulate from day to day his production, as does the artificial producer, if he saw that he was producing more than the market could absorb he could instantly curtail his production, and if, in addition to that, he had the power to control the price of the commodity he was producing, a tariff would necessarily be selfishly beneficial to him, because he could fix the price. Having control of the article, in fact, a monopoly of it, he could fix the domestic price as high as the tariff wall, because none could be imported under that, and sell it to the American consumer at that price, and then whatever surplus he had he could sell in the open market in competition with whatever supplies the world produced. But, having no control over the price now, and it being physically and morally impossible, under the conditions of agriculture the world over, for him to have a control of the price, whatever benefit he gets from a tariff law is at the will of those who control the market.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. According to the Senator's argument, then, the farmers of this country have reached a stage where it is possible for them to limit the supply. Did I understand the Senator to say that?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; I have not said anything of the kind. God knows I wish they could from day to day limit the supply. I think this year they are going to limit the supply. Yes; if they have any sense of self-love; if they have any kind of self-respect, this is one year when they are not going to grow a crop to be subject to the caprice of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department and the speculators of this country, but are going to bring the American people to a realizing sense of their dependence upon the man with the hoe. So I hope this is one year when they will restrict production.

Mr. GRONNA. We will assume that to be true; but how will it help the American producer to limit the supply if the people in America can go right to our next-door neighbor and buy without having to pay any tariff or any tax at all?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I frankly admit, as I said a moment ago, that there are certain circumstances where a tariff would benefit, perhaps, if those who control the market saw fit to let it do so; but I really am seeking light on this subject, and I should like to have the Senator tell me, because he has done me the honor of listening very attentively when I have tried to explain to him certain conditions down in my section, just how he hopes to have this bill help the price of wheat when we produce a surplus, and therefore must necessarily depend upon the foreign price to fix the American price?

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, if the Senator will permit me, I disagree entirely with the Senator's assumption that although we may have a small surplus which we have to export, that small surplus regulates the prices; but it is too long a story to go into, and I shall not do it in the Senator's time. But if the American wheat grower has, we will say, 50,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat that he can spare, I think any Senator can readily see that that small surplus will not regulate the price of the entire crop of the American farmer.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] a day or two ago called attention to the fact that we had exported more than 200,000,000 bushels of wheat. Of course, a great deal of that wheat was Canadian wheat. He also called attention to the fact that wheat was nearly as high or as high in price in Canada as it was in the United States. The Senator must realize that so long as the miller in the United States can go across the Canadian line and buy wheat, if it is only 1 cent a bushel cheaper than he can buy it here in the United States, due not entirely to a tariff, but to conditions which exist to-day, as the

Senator knows, in the great depreciation of the Canadian currency, the miller will buy in Canada, and that will depress the price to the American farmer. There is not a Senator here who can successfully contradict that statement.

This is not only a question affecting wheat. On yesterday Mr. Frank Horne—I will mention the name in order to show good faith—who is perhaps the best-posted man in the United States on the question of cold storage, told me that he had in his own warehouses more than 5,000,000 pounds of Danish butter. Does not the Senator agree that that will help to force down the price of butter to the American producer?

I could enumerate many, many articles where a tariff would protect the American farmer, the dairy farmer, the cattle grower, the sheep grower. The Senator knows as well as I do, because he has helped me on many occasions in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that millions and millions of pounds of frozen mutton have been imported from Australia and from Argentina and from other countries, shipped into this country when as a matter of fact there was no market for the American product. Does the Senator mean to say that it would not protect the American grower to impose a tax upon that foreign product?

Mr. President, it is a fallacious argument. It can not be sustained by facts. A tax imposed upon these products will help the American farmer. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to suggest just one thing in addition to what my colleague has said, and directly bearing upon his question as to whether, if we have a surplus, it is possible to get any benefit from a protection against importations if we must export?

Suppose we have 50,000,000, 75,000,000 or 100,000,000 bushels of wheat to export in the shape of flour. In three months or four months suppose we have exported it, and then suppose we say that we will keep grain from Canada from coming in here, where there are two or three hundred million more bushels. The moment that we have exported that and have gotten down near to the real demand for consumption in the United States, suppose we should export 20,000,000 more than perhaps our surplus. Can not the Senator see that that would immediately drive the prices up, provided we could keep this flood of Canadian wheat from coming into the country?

We are exporting every month, and in the section in which my colleague and myself live we never export that wheat. Not a bushel of it is exported; and the fact that you export some Ohio wheat and Maryland wheat and Oklahoma wheat and California wheat would have but very little effect upon the price of the spring wheat in the country, provided there was a shortage there, and there is a shortage to-day if we can keep the Canadian wheat out.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, just a word in reply. I could understand how the situation that these two Senators have named could bring about the result that they say would follow if we could export the surplus before we began to sell the American product, but the two go along *pari passu*. That might very well happen if we could export the surplus and then shut the door on the balance, but the surplus is not exported in any such manner. It is exported right along with the other. If we could export all the surplus American cotton, and perhaps export more than would leave a supply sufficient to meet the demand at home, and then shut the door, it might have the same result on American cotton; but we do not do anything of that kind, because before we get through exporting the surplus and consuming the amount that is necessary for home consumption we have made another crop, and it is an endless chain.

You never know when you have just what would supply America for the balance of the time until another crop comes in, and how much has been exported.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to say that I believe there is contracted now in the shape of wheat and flour from the United States more than sufficient to take our entire surplus if we could cut out importations from Canada.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator means that that much has been contracted for by foreign countries?

Mr. McCUMBER. By foreign countries in the case of flour and wheat, both.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. And if you could get the wherewithal to finance your operations from other countries.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; but I say it is contracted for by those who can buy, and if we could cut off the Canadian inflow at this time we would soon bring the American product down to a point where there would not be a bushel to export, and then our prices would go skyward.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me to make a motion to adjourn? It is a quarter of 5 and Saturday afternoon.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; I think, being Saturday, the Senate ought to adjourn at this time.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29, 1921.

REAPPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

James Taggart Kerr to be colonel.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

To be captains.

Clifford Michael Ollivetti.

Franklin Prague Shaw.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

To be majors.

John Henry Mellom.

John Albert Paegelow.

Alfred McCalmont Wilson.

To be second lieutenant.

Charles William Dietz.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

Harry F. Wilson to be captain.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Charles Macon Wesson to be major.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Consuelo Andrew Seoane to be major.

AIR SERVICE.

To be majors.

Jenner Young Chisum.

Fred Hughes Coleman.

Raymond Sidney Bamberger.

To be captain.

Archie Wright Barry.

To be first lieutenant.

Oliver Grant Brush.

CAVALRY.

To be majors.

Elkin Leland Franklin.

Cuthbert Powell Stearns.

To be captain.

Frederic Waldo Whitney.

To be first lieutenants.

Vance Whiting Batchelor.

Erle Fletcher Cress.

William Tecumseh Haldeman.

Joseph Idus Lambert.

Charlie Campbell McCall.

Woodbury Freeman Pride.

Robert Oney Wright.

Loren Francis Parmley.

To be second lieutenants.

Arthur Burton Clark.

Robert Lowry Freeman.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

To be majors.

Benjamin Lafayette Carroll.

Clifford Mitchell Tuteur.

Edmund Louis Gruber.

To be captains.

Solomon Foote Clark.

George Peterson Winton.

To be first lieutenants.

Dover Bell.

Charles Allen Easterbrook.

Fred Bidwell Lyle.

Ray Locke McDonald.

Earle Starr Neilond.
Calvin Sutton Richards.
Kenneth Smith Wallace.
Irvin Henry Zelfff.
Paul Clarence Boylan.
Stewart Franklin Miller.

To be second lieutenants.

Chester Arthur Horne.

Paul Robert Menzies Miller.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be majors.

Raymond Hope Fenner.

Graham Parker.

Robert Ross Welshimer.

To be first lieutenants.

Lloyd William Goeppert.

Charles Sydney Hammond.

George Curtis McFarland.

John Wesley Orcutt.

To be second lieutenant.

Lynn Packard Vane.

INFANTRY.

To be lieutenant colonel.

Wilson Bryant Burt.

To be majors.

Frederick Martin Armstrong.

Alfred Ballin.

Lloyd Baxter Bennett.

Burton Ebenezer Bowen.

Boltos Elder Brewer.

William Buerkle.

Harry Jackson Castles.

Bernard Chandler.

William Patrick Kelleher.

Frank Theodore McCabe.

Max S. Murray.

Isaac Joshua Nichol.

Frank Leslie Pyle.

Per Ramee.

Chester Cordwell Staples.

Joseph Cumming Thomas.

James Henry Tierney.

Albert Tucker.

Seth Lathrop Weld.

James Madison White.

Charles Lawrence Byrne.

Bradford Grethen Chynoweth.

Frederick Willis Manley.

Albert Tucker.

To be captains.

Marvin Randolph Baer.

Carl Archibald Bishop.

John Lloyd Burg.

Sidney Erickson.

Mahlen Augustus Joyce.

Robert Louis Moseley.

John Harry Neff.

George Washington Price.

George Lamberton Smith.

Benjamin Seymour Stocker.

George Cornelius Charlton.

Charles Harrison Corlett.

Edson Irwin Small.

Norman Paul Williams.

To be first lieutenants.

Lewis Russel Armstrong.

Ernest Clifford Ayer.

Roy Judson Caperton.

Ernst Esser.

Charles Campbell Holliday.

Paul Kellam.

Joseph William McIntyre.

John Francis Pahlke.

Walter Raymond Peck.

Peter Paul Salgado.

Joseph Ware Whitney.

Sterling Clifton Robertson.

Edward Hamilton Young.

George Francis Wooley, jr.

Joseph Bartholomew Conmy.

Eugene Joseph Minarelli FitzGerald.
William Frederick Gent.
Clarence Ronald Peck.
Michael Al Quinn.
Francis Dundas Ross.
Frank Emil Stoner.
Lester Austin Webb.
Norris Adron Wimberly.
William Burbridge Yancey.

To be second lieutenants.

Homer Bobo Battenberg.
Henry William Brandhorst.
William Ernest Donegan.
Hugh Tom Edwards.
Harold Lester Egan.
Frederick Brodie Forbes.
Carley Lawrence Marshall.
William Augustus Weinberger.
Carl Cooley Burgess.
Charles Ream Jackson.
Albert Smith Rice.
Robert Robinson.
Charles Linton Williams.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Edward Hayward Raymond to be first lieutenant.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE.

Crawford McMann Kellogg to be first lieutenant.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

To be colonels.

Frederick Melvin Brown.
Nathan Dana Ely.
William Oscar Gilbert.
Sherman Moreland.

To be lieutenant colonels.

William Alexander Graham.
Charles Loring.
George Lemuel McKeeby.
William Burton Pistole.
William Catron Rigby.
Hugh Carnes Smith.
Amos Robert Stallings.
Grant Taylor Trent.

To be majors.

Albert Charles Arnold.
Harry Anton Auer.
Henry Roy Bitzing.
Edward James Boughton.
Russell Henry Brennan.
William Foster Burns.
Walter Dew Cline.
William Mellard Connor, jr.
Myron Cady Cramer.
Charles Clement Cresson.
Jason Fremont Defendorf.
John Putman Dinsmore.
Albert Francis Drake.
Joseph Marcus Dreyer.
Gordon Louis Finley.
Mark Emmet Guerin.
Frank Wade Halliday.
Lawrence Hyskell Hedrick.
George Place Hill.
Lester Seneca Hill, jr.
Elza Charles Johnson.
Archibald King.
Walter Michael Krimbill.
William Walter Lemmond.
Charles Milton McCorkle.
Charles Henry McDonald.
John Marshall Markley.
Frederic Granville Munson.
John Archibald Parker.
LeRoy Reeves.
John Abdiel Smith.
Lucius Meriwether Smith.
James Howard Stansfield.
William Arthur Turnbull.
Rembert Gary Watson.
George Pentzer Whitsett.
Charles Redding Williams.
James Arthur Willis.

Frederic Gilbert Bauer.
Felix Edward Blackburn.
Theodore Hall.
Roland Martin Hollock.
Louis Lehman Korn.

To be captains.

Louis Eugene Appleby.
William Johnston Bacon.
Charles Arthur Barnard.
Humphrey Biddle.
Henry Clyde Clark.
Thurman Alden DeBolt.
George Augustine Frazer.
Arthur Henry Garland.
Perrett Franklin Gault.
William Langley Granbery, jr.
Robert Edwards Hannay, jr.
Henry Harmeling.
Thomas Leo Heffernan.
Burritt Havilah Hinman.
Hubert Don Hoover.
William Joseph Hughes, jr.
Terry A. Lyon.
Hollie Lee Mason.
Louis Bolduc Montfort.
William Penn Montgomery.
Fannin Adkin Morgan.
James Edward Morrisette.
Homer Cling Parker.
Emanuel Rabin Parnass.
Emil Charles Rawitser.
Logan Norman Rock.
William Aloysius Rounds.
Edward Bernard Schlant.
Frank Eckel Taylor.
Thomas Tidball Trapnell.
John Rowe Wheeler.
Gilbert Sylvester Woolworth.
George Nathaniel Beakley.
Arthur William Beer.
Chester Arthur Bennett.
Rowan Adams Greer.
Philip Henry Marcum.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

To be colonel.

James Alfred Moss.

To be majors.

Edgar Wilson Mumford.
John Henry Adams.
Neill Edwards Bailey.
Henry Bailey Barry.
Samuel Roland Dishman.
Reginald Love Foster.
Henry Lincoln Green.
William Wickware Griffin.
James Merrill Hutchinson.
John Douglas Kilpatrick.
George Luberoff.
John McClintock.
Joseph Dennis McKeany.
Drury Kemp Mitchell.
Harry Thornton Moore.
John Milton Ritchie.
Clarence Herbert Tingle.
Rigby Dewoody Valliant.
Henry Lloyd Ward.
Francis Bradford Wheaton.
Louis Clarence Wilson.

To be captains.

George Edwin Adamson.
George Marshall Alden.
Richard Allen.
William James Allen.
James Laban Alverson.
Alston Bertram Ames.
Emile Peter Antonovich.
George Washington Armitage.
John Robert Bailey.
Thomas Otis Baker.
Archibald Lamonte Barber.
Harold Arthur Barnes.
Frank Barr.
Edmund Joseph Barry.
Ralph John Bauereisen.

Charles Isidor Bazire.
 Robert Stanley Beard.
 Edward Berg.
 Elenius Berg.
 Fred van Antwerp Berger.
 Edward Henry Besse.
 John Biggar.
 Emil Herbert Block.
 Ralph Hibbler Bogle.
 Roland Capel Bower.
 Richard Pegram Boykin.
 Edward Joseph Brady.
 Walter Sutherland Bramble.
 Albert Jordan Brandon.
 Charles Alexander Brinkley.
 John Aloysius Broderick.
 Abram Vedder Brower.
 Charles Conrad Brown.
 Egbert Jansen Buckbee.
 Lewis Merrill Bullock.
 Ora Bundy.
 Charles Frederic Burkhardt.
 Warren Atherton Butler.
 William Daniel Candler.
 Daniel Joseph Canty.
 Charles Otway Carter.
 Noble Carter.
 William Edward Cashman.
 William Cassidy.
 George Moseley Chandler.
 Albert Jamerson Chappell.
 Charles Leonard Charlebois.
 Harry Harrison Cheal.
 James Stewart Clarke.
 John Matthew Clarke.
 James Douglas Cleary.
 Elbert Cock.
 Lawrence Dennis Collins.
 William Thomas Connatser.
 Lorenzo Irvin Cooke.
 John Wallace Cooper.
 John Leland Corbett.
 Joseph Spencer Crane.
 Chalmers Dale.
 Ezra Davis.
 John James Denning.
 Joseph Henry Dent.
 Joseph Wade Denton.
 Alexander Forest Dershimer.
 Harry Dittenbaugh.
 Leonard Smith Doten.
 John North Douglas.
 Lewis Bradley Douglas.
 Alexander Calhoun Doyle.
 Edward Peter Doyle.
 Harrison Mortimer Duffill.
 Wallace Edwin Durst.
 Nelson Hammond Duval.
 Carroll Edgar.
 LeRoy Murray Edwards.
 Charles Edward Ehle.
 Earl Eikenberry.
 Clifford Maul Elwell.
 James Benjamin Ettridge.
 Henry Spencer Evans.
 William Shipp Everts.
 Hugh Franklin Ewing.
 Reuben Lee Fain.
 John Fawcett.
 Frederick Felix.
 Ocea LeRoy Ferris.
 Robert Baxter Field.
 James Jacob Firestone.
 Romeo Henry Freer.
 John Newton Gage.
 Harry Franklin Gardner.
 Edward Marion George.
 Louis Bronson Gerow.
 Douglas Arthur Gillespie.
 John Alfred Gilman.
 Michael Joseph Gilmore.
 Harold Ogier Godwin.
 Edwin Goodwyn.
 Meade Montgomery Goodwyn.
 Patrick John Gorman.

Michael Nolan Greeley.
 Clarence Henry Greene.
 David Grove.
 Eugene Edwin Hagan.
 Frederick Eugene Hagen.
 George Henry Hahn.
 Joseph Dixon Hahn.
 Cyrus Wilson Haney.
 Paul Bronsart Harm.
 Harry Keller Harmon.
 George Harrison Harrell.
 Eugene John Heller.
 Fred Charles Henke.
 Randolph James Hernandez.
 Frederick Louis Herron.
 Joseph Howard Hickey.
 George Foster Hobson.
 Paul August Hodapp.
 Thomas Leroy Holland.
 Percival Simon Holmes.
 Charles Walter Hoover.
 Wilson Tyler Howe.
 Paul Frederick Huber.
 John Anderson Hughes.
 Henry John Hunker.
 John Van Ness Ingram.
 Asa Irwin.
 Charles Julius Isley.
 Carl Hugo Jabelonsky.
 Orville Jackson.
 Wallace J. Jaka.
 August Christian Jensen.
 Hans Christopher Johansen.
 Floyd Duren Jones.
 Matthew Hall Jones.
 Albert Kalb.
 John Kasper.
 Daniel Kearns.
 Charles Garfield Keene.
 Francis Joseph Kelly.
 Patrick Kelly.
 Thomas Kenny.
 Edward Allen Keys.
 Herbert Lee Kidwell.
 Charles Jacob Kindler.
 Robert William King.
 Herman Christopher Kliber.
 Henry Bert Knowles.
 Arthur Louis Koch.
 Gus Smith Kopple.
 William Korst.
 Charles Adolph Kraus.
 George Eugene Lamb.
 Otto James Langtry.
 William Mathew Larnier.
 William Herbert Lee.
 Clements William Legge.
 Arthur Leslie Lemon.
 Alonzo Lincoln Littell.
 Frank Ely Locke.
 Clarence Longacre.
 Daniel William MacCormack.
 James Thomas MacDonald.
 John Arthur McDonald.
 Murdock Allen McFadden.
 Graves Barney McGary.
 Thomas Bayton McGill.
 Thomas Jefferson McGrath.
 Bernard Edward McKeever.
 John Joseph McManus.
 William Cone Mahoney.
 William Henry Mallon.
 Phillip Henry Mallory.
 Samuel Joseph Davis Marshall.
 Lincoln Martin.
 Francis Irwin Maslin.
 Stephen Burdette Massey.
 Lewis Bernard Massie.
 Theodore Russell Maul.
 John William Mayben.
 Peter Francis Meade.
 Edward Augustus Mechling.
 Jack Lester Meyer.
 Clarence Lloyd Middleton.
 William Henry Moore.

Charles Jerrold Morelle.
 Charles A. Morrow.
 John Amos Nelson.
 Halbert H. Noyes.
 Daniel O'Connell.
 John Clayton O'Dell.
 Charles De Witt O'Neal.
 Jacob Herman Osterman.
 Oliver Louis Overmyer.
 Alexander Mitchell Owens.
 Arthur Parker.
 Mortlock Stratton Pettit.
 Allen William Pollitt.
 John Andrew Forter.
 Milo Cooper Pratt.
 George Hebard Pryor.
 Walter Kenneth Quigley.
 Charles Alexander Radcliffe.
 William Hickman Radcliffe.
 George Walker Rees.
 Edward Joseph Riordan.
 William Fred Riter.
 Ethel Alvin Robbins.
 Albert Clifford Roberts.
 Barton Potter Root.
 Earl Harrison Rosemere.
 Edmund D. Russ.
 Paul Gerhardt Rutten.
 William Henry Sadler.
 John Thomas Salle.
 Leon Ewart Savage.
 John Smith Scally.
 Edward Oscar Schairer.
 Joseph Edward Schillo.
 John Schocklin.
 George Herbert Schumacher.
 Simeon Jackson Seals.
 John Louis Shanley.
 Robert Emmett Shannon.
 Franklin Denwood Shawn.
 French Cameron Simpson.
 Eugene Hiram Sleeper.
 James Eugene Smith.
 Joseph Evan Smith.
 William Wolff Smith.
 Harvey Monroe Snyder.
 David McGoodwin Speed.
 Arthur Walter Stanley.
 Frank Charles Starr.
 George Horton Steel.
 John Henning Stern.
 Harry Morse Thatcher.
 Elmer Gwyn Thomas.
 George Ernest Thompson.
 Gilbert Livingston Thompson.
 John William Thompson.
 William Otis Thornton.
 Nels Johnson Thorud.
 Harry Thurber.
 Frank Palmer Tingley.
 James Howard Todd.
 Gerald Howe Totten.
 Ernest Leonard Paul Treuthardt.
 Wallace Augustus Trumbull.
 John Moody Tuther.
 Hiram Edwin Tuttle.
 Amos Tyree.
 George Frederick Unmacht.
 Harry A. Vacquerie.
 Charles Van Buren.
 Rufus Walter.
 Samuel Houston Ware.
 William Elliott Ramsden Warner.
 David Andrew Watt.
 Peter William Wey.
 Ira J. Wharton.
 John Champlin Whitaker.
 Will Rainwater White.
 Charles Bertrand Wickins.
 Hugh Williams.
 Lewis Barksdale Willis.
 William Arthur Worley.
 George Young.
 George Henry Zautner.
 Samuel Israel Zeidner.

Lewis Conway Baird.
 Thomas Banbury.
 J. Leland Bass.
 George Albert Bentley.
 Carl Louis Bernau.
 Walter Board.
 William Robert Buckley.
 John Thompson Conover.
 Edwin Vivian Dunstan.
 William Edward Chase Elkington.
 Samuel Thomas Griffith.
 Thomas Courtenay Locke.
 Charles Newton Neal.
 Edgar Fries Nickum.
 Leroy Henry Palmer.
 Edward Raeder.
 William McKendree Scott.
 Hubert Albert Stecker.
 Thayer Dawson Sterling.
 Walter Ambrose Swallow.
 Malhon Kirkbride Taylor.
 Rufus G. Vaughan.
 John Moultrie Ward.
 William Hammond Waugh.
 Charles David Weirbach.
 Brom Ridley Whitthorne, jr.
 George Watson Womack, jr.
 Thomas Washington Woodyard.
 Herman Carl C. Zimmermann.

To be first lieutenants,

Mortimer Clark Addoms, jr.
 Harry Martin Andrews.
 Walter Andrewsen.
 Simon David Archer.
 John Henry Balmat, jr.
 Frank Marion Barrell.
 Homer H. Beall.
 Paul Lindsay Beard.
 Arthur Lewis Benedict.
 Hubert Ward Beyette.
 Mortimer Buell Birdseye.
 Frederick LeRoy Black.
 Robert Andrew Blair.
 Frank H. Booth.
 James Elmer Boush.
 Levin Arthur Bowland.
 John T. Boyle.
 Bruno William Brooks.
 Walter Floyd Brown.
 Birnie Lee Brunson.
 Mark Vinton Branson.
 Charles Thomas Burk.
 Richard August Burkle.
 Charles Walton Cameron.
 Joseph Branson Canfield.
 Charles Louis Carpenter.
 John Joseph Cassidy.
 Francis Saylor Challenger.
 Charles Chalice, jr.
 John Conrad Christophel.
 Charles Matthew Clancy.
 William Mathew Cline.
 James Hugh Conlin.
 Henry James Conner.
 Daniel David Coons.
 Bert Emory Cooper.
 Charles Allen Cotton.
 Edgar Gresham Coursen, jr.
 Thomas Francis Crahan.
 Willis Dodge Cronkhite.
 Alexander Hill Cummings.
 Raymond Dailey.
 Freeman Bozeman Daniel.
 Arthur Edwin Danielson.
 Fred Ernest Davis.
 William Day.
 Dorcy Le Roy Decker.
 Joseph De Garmo.
 Leo Joseph Dillon.
 John Thomas Dollard.
 Martin Burtis Dunbar.
 Frank Dunn.
 James William Dye.
 Lemuel Edwin Edwards.

Richard Thomas Edwards.
 Joseph Lawrence Erickson.
 Fred William Fallin.
 Howard Farmer.
 Frank Strong Ferguson.
 George King Ferguson.
 Bernard Joseph Finan.
 Francis Valentine FitzGerald.
 Ralph Eli Fleischer.
 John Thomas Fleming.
 Charles Franklin Fletter.
 Wilmer Micajah Flinn.
 Frederick Matthew Fogle.
 George Ray Ford.
 George Franklin Foss.
 Albert Jamison Fox.
 John Brandon Franks.
 Frank Scott Frickeilton.
 Harry Samuel Fuller.
 Claude Leslie Gamble.
 Herbert Allen Gardner.
 Lloyd Milton Garner.
 George Bury Garrett.
 Thomas Simons Garrett.
 Charles Hugh Gibbon.
 Melvin Reginald Ginn.
 Joseph Pemberton Glandon.
 Edward Joseph Glynn.
 John Dillard Goodrich.
 Enoch Graf.
 Ray Harrison Green.
 William Henry Green.
 George Mitchell Grimes.
 Malcolm Douglas Grimes.
 Ernest August Guillemet.
 Irwin Wilson Guth.
 Paul Roy Guthrie.
 Harry Edgar Hagan.
 Herman Goodwin Halverson.
 James Morris Hammond.
 Dorris Aby Hanes.
 Harvey Edward Hanna.
 Peter Hanses.
 James Joseph Harris.
 Augustus Spencer Harrison.
 Ellis Wiswell Hartford.
 William King Harvey.
 Otto Harwood.
 John Alfred Hatfield.
 Bradford Nelson Headley.
 Elisha Kenneth Henson.
 Roy William Hern.
 Floy Lyle Hester.
 Harry Price Higgins.
 Chester David Hilton.
 Maurice Allen Hockman.
 Henry Hockwald.
 John Roscoe Holt.
 Elmer Hostetter.
 John Robert Hubbard.
 Arthur Drummond Hughes.
 Seward William Hulse.
 Lewis Edward Hunt.
 Harry Bassett Huston.
 John Conrad Hutcheson.
 Charles Ferdinand Itzen.
 Arthur Alva Jackson.
 William Joshua Jackson.
 Simon Jacobson.
 Irwin Harold Joffee.
 Clarence Edward Jones.
 Franz Joseph Jonitz.
 John Barthell Joseph.
 Charles John Kalberer.
 Martin Luther Kelley.
 Joseph Patrick Kelly.
 William Thombs Kilborn, jr.
 John Archie King.
 Harry Kirsner.
 Arthur Theodore Kreh.
 Ernest Kuehn.
 Edward William Lachmiller.
 Leander Larson.
 Richard Laird Lawrence.
 Franklin B. Lees.

Arthur Shelby Levinsohn.
 George Thomas Liles.
 Clarence Lineberger.
 Albert Lobitz.
 Doc Elwood Lowry, jr.
 James Henry Lyman.
 Frank Joseph McCormack.
 Harvey Watson McHenry.
 Shirley Wiggins McIlwain.
 William Ross Mackinnon.
 Arthur Joseph McShane.
 Charles Jesse Mabbutt.
 George Maginn.
 Benedict Leo Maloney.
 Justice William Martin.
 Eugene Gordon Mathews.
 Joseph Mathew Matson.
 George Milroy Mayer.
 Barney Leland Meeden.
 Stanleigh Megargee.
 Frank Arthur Mertz.
 William Hershel Middleswart.
 Robert Lake Miller.
 Thomas Henry Mills.
 Herbert Cossitt Mitchell.
 Frank Edward Monville.
 Frank Morell.
 Edward John Morris.
 Lawrence Benedict Morris.
 John Peter Neu.
 Francis Norton Neville.
 Fred Tenderholm Neville.
 Raglan Inkerman Nicoll.
 Howard Burdette Nurse.
 Philip Joseph O'Brien.
 Maurice Paul O'Connor.
 Charles Wilshire Older.
 Franklin Overheiser.
 LeRoy F. Pape.
 Joseph Noll Parrott.
 Harry Tolman Partridge.
 William Henry Payne.
 Charles Perfect.
 Frank Charles Peters.
 Talmage Phillips.
 William Minnis Pierce.
 Ralph Pollock, jr.
 Frank Egerton Powell.
 William G. Preston.
 Wesley Wright Price.
 Arthur Bothwell Proctor.
 George Elmer Pruitt.
 Arnold Melville Reeve.
 Leo Aloysius Regan.
 Wilbert Vernon Renner.
 Ernest Andrew Reynolds.
 John Marion Rhodes.
 Charles Edward Richardson.
 William Hunt Roach.
 John Myres Rooks.
 Glenn A. Ross.
 John Vincent Rowan.
 Daniel Augustus Rupp.
 John Alexander Russell.
 Howard Sallee.
 Nels Gustaf Sandelin.
 James A. Sanders.
 Frank Harry Scheiner.
 William Henry Schnackenberg.
 Ralph Reynolds Seger.
 Turner Ransom Sharp.
 Walter Lane Shearman.
 Peter Shemonsky.
 Garrison Francis Shields.
 Earl Francis Shriver.
 Kinsley Wilcox Slauson.
 Harry Burgie Smith.
 Raymond Donaldson Smith.
 Robert Stuart Smith.
 Harry Coleman Snyder.
 George Frederick Spann.
 Holden Spear.
 Harold Spigelmyre.
 Manning Wilfred Spotswood.
 Charles Emile Stafford.

Charles Stalsburg.
 Gordon Hall Steele.
 George Stetekluh.
 Arthur Milroy Stork.
 Edward Flagg Sweeney.
 Laurence Daly Talbot.
 George Frederick Robert Taylor.
 James Francis Taylor.
 Cecil Oliver Temple.
 Robert Van Thomas.
 Charles Orval Thrasher.
 Abraham Bernard Thumel.
 John Robert Tighe.
 John Paul Tillman.
 George Peter Toft.
 Edward James Turgeon.
 Cyril Wilhelm Van Cortlandt.
 Benjamin Franklin Vandervoort.
 Isaac Devaus Van Meter.
 Hal Tanner Vigor.
 John Summerfield Vincent.
 Harry Lauman Waggoner.
 George Wald.
 Elsmere Joe Walters.
 Tom Ward.
 Harold Jesse Warlick.
 Joel Franklin Watson.
 Louis Clifford Webster.
 Thomas Judson Weed.
 James Weir.
 John Patrick Welch.
 Joseph Rudolph Wessely.
 George William West.
 Frank Dennison Wheeler.
 Ernest Klein White.
 Hugh Whitt.
 Herbert Foster Wilkinson.
 James Wesley Willford.
 Hartwell Newton Williams.
 Robert Smith Williams.
 Robert Trisch Willkie.
 Charles Frederick Wilson.
 David Ransom Wolverton.
 Charles Wesley Wood.
 Lawrence Stanley Woods.
 Ralph Harry Woolsey.
 Leighton Coleman Worthington.
 Fred Tobias Yount.
 Harry Leo Zeller.
 Anton Zeman.
 Theodore Tyler Barnett.
 William Thomas Doran.
 George Darryll Gamble.
 Russell William Goodyear.
 Letcher Ogle Grice.
 Hope McCreery.
 William Van Dillen Newbegin.
 Thomas Jett Powell.
 John Jacob Raezer.
 Cecil Claude Ray.
 Harry Ray Springer.
 Frederic Robert Whippler.
 Leslie Shaw Williams.

To be second lieutenants.

John Francis Alcure.
 Wallace Marmaduke Allison.
 Claude Bertram Avera.
 Samuel Howes Baker.
 John Augustus Barksdale.
 George Thomas Barnes.
 Albert Joseph Beale.
 Clarence John Blake.
 George Cocke Bland.
 Leslie Eugene Bowman.
 Albin Nace Caldwell.
 Harry Lincoln Calvin.
 John Fant Carraway.
 Charles Simpson Carroll.
 Frank Teeter Caulkins.
 Gustavus Franzle Chapman.
 Thomas Herbert Chapman.
 Newman Hall Cherry.
 John Fidelis Connell.
 Oliver Edward Cound.
 Fred Ross Cowan.

John Bigham Crandell.
 Samuel Clifton Cratch.
 Orville Ervin Davis.
 Louis de Jussewicz.
 Laurence Delmore.
 Arthur Ellis Dewey.
 Housan Wayne Duncan.
 James Albert Durnford.
 Hartwell Matthew Elder.
 Harry Van Horn Ellis.
 Humphrey Swygart Evans.
 James Thomas Falin.
 Ora Edward Fately.
 Claude Weaver Feagin.
 Oscar George Fegan.
 Leonard Francis Felio.
 Roland Thorpe Fenton.
 Edward Vincent Freeman.
 Ralph Willerton French.
 William Joseph Gainey.
 Chester Wright Gates.
 John Cyrus Gates.
 Will Gillett Gooch.
 James Michael Grey.
 James Bayard Haley.
 Hugh Sydney Harpole.
 Howell Harrell.
 Oscar Harmon Harris.
 George Eitle Hartman.
 John Thomas Heins.
 Frank Austin Heywood.
 John Hancock Holder.
 William James Horrigan.
 Stanley Hunsicker Hunsicker.
 John Augustus Hunt.
 Warren Crouse Hurst.
 Carroll Ray Hutchins.
 William Chauncey Hutt.
 Day Jewell.
 Homer William Jones.
 Luther Earl Keithly.
 Gaylord Burnam Kidwell.
 Francis Hill Kuhn.
 Austin Webb Lee.
 Paul Harter Leech.
 Arthur John Lodge.
 Otto Montrose Low.
 John Bicknell Luscombe.
 Alva Edison McConnell.
 Frazier Earl McIntosh.
 John Thomas McKay.
 Neal Henry McKay.
 Edward Brigham McKinley.
 Frank Griffin Marchman.
 Albert Earle Matlack.
 Clifford James Moore.
 Werner Watson Moore.
 William Harry Mosby.
 Rudolph Bror Nelson.
 Halbert Eli Norton.
 Carl Herbert Odeen.
 Roger Frederic O'Leary.
 Mitchell Franklin Orr.
 Vere Painter.
 Elmer Karl Pettibone.
 Wayne McVeigh Pickels.
 John Joseph Powers.
 Charles Wingate Reed.
 Ralph Gordon Richards.
 Victor Lafayette Robinson.
 Lynn Rogers.
 Richard Geter Rogers.
 Harry Isaac Rosen.
 Edward John Lewis Russell.
 Kenneth Howe Sanford.
 Lawrence Brownlee Savage.
 Louis Bernard Saxe.
 Rudolph George Schmidt.
 Charles Eugene Schwarz.
 Neil Brown Simms.
 Lawrence Lee Simpson.
 John Lawrence Slade.
 Clifford Smith.
 McGregor Snodgrass.
 Harold DeLancey Stetson.

Laurel Eugene Stone.
Gerard Swarthout.
Samuel De Witt Tallmadge.
Nathan William Thomas.
George Richard Thompson.
Robert Grant Thorp.
Joe Shurlock Underwood.
Robert Johnson Van Epps.
William Edwin Vecqueray.
Leonard Vezina.
Andre Leonard Violante.
Duval Crump Watkins.
Lester Frank Watson.
Edmund Graham West.
Robert Oliver White.
Walter Talcott Wilsey.
Milton Edward Wilson.
Russell Calvert Worthington.
George Cobb Wynne.
James Wellington Younger.
George De Vere Barnes.
Daniel J. Dunn.
Elden Quincy Faust.
Ernest A. Fischer.
William Burl Johnson.
Robert Franklin Jones.
Eugene Walter Lewis.
John Daniel O'Connell.
Charles John Wynne.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be majors.

Austin Henry Brown.
Frederick William Browne.
Thomas Leroy Clear.
Frank Wright Duryea.
Frank M. Holmes.
Benjamin Lester Jacobson.
Thomas Egbert Jansen.
William Harden Keith.
Arthur Leon Webb.
George Morgan Newell.

To be captains.

Herbert Baldwin.
Biglow Beaver Barbee.
Francis Camillus Beebee.
Ben Batre Boon.
Thomas Harry Chambers.
George Warren Cooke.
Henry Mahoney Denning.
Chester Jerome Dick.
Charles Gilpin Dobbins.
Harry Stockton Farish.
Eugene Martin Foster.
Claude Evan Gray.
Adel Curry Harden.
Remi Paul Hueper.
Royal Granville Jenks.
Melvin Jones.
Frank James Keelty.
Robert Joseph Kennedy.
Thomas Brown Kennedy.
Harry Borden Love!
Edmund Waring McLarren.
Jacob Ramser McNiel.
Theodore Ferry Powell.
Louis Hartwell Price.
Arthur Estcourt Sawyer.
Philip Augustin Scholl.
Lyman Leon Simms.
Oliver Tillman Simpson.
William Nycum Skyles.
Francis Paul Sullivan.
Irvin Vorus Todd.
Jacob J. Van Putten, jr.
Voler V. Viles.
Ernest Walter Wilson.
Walter Orr Woods.
Lawrence Peter Worrall.
Walter Harold Sutherland.

To be first lieutenants.

Nicholas Hamner Cobbs.
John May Connor.
Oliver William DeGruchy.
John Henry Doherty.

Chester Russell Fouts.
Frank Fremont Fulton.
Paul Jacob Guinther.
Waldo Sebastian Ickes.
Everett Foster Rea.
John Liggat Tunstall.

To be second lieutenants.

Francis Paul Connelly.
John Harold McFall.
Joseph Felix Routhier.
Cola Edgar Stone.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS.

To be captains.

Alexander Berkowitz.
Lonzo Russell Bice.
Theodore Bitterman.
Arthur Elmer Brown.
Clark Leon Brown.
Oscar Burkard.
Jason David Byers.
Harry Alexander Davis.
John Henry Dawson.
Herbert Noble Dean.
Robert Alexander Dickson.
Meyer McCollister Dougherty.
Thomas Marcus England.
Robert Sydney Ferguson.
William John Freebourn.
Harry Nelson Fuller.
Carl Graner.
Earl Francis Greene.
James Faris Hamner.
Samuel Jackson Harris.
Frank Holt.
Robert Burns Irving.
Henry Killikelly.
Kenneth George Kincaid.
Chester Berry Leedom.
James Norris Lothrop.
Edward Albert Lovelly, jr.
William McFarland.
Robert Sheldon McKenzie.
Arthur Morehouse.
Samuel Wetherill Pennington.
Clifford Henry Perry.
Robert Peterson.
Walter Lee Phares.
Albert Arthur Roby.
John Raymond Sands.
James Albert Scull.
Samuel Smelsey.
Clarence Oliver Stimmel.
Otto Arthur Tandrop.
Frederick Thomas.
George Edgar Vass.
Eugene Weber.
Max Weinberg.
Fred Osbourne Wells.
Paul L. Whitmarsh.
Thomas Garfield Williams.
William Clarence Williams.
George Clinton Young.
Francis Joseph Eisenman.
Samuel Marcus.

To be first lieutenants.

Robert Rainy Brooks.
Edmund Burke.
John Werry Cleave.
Charles Frederick Eble.
Harry Greeno.
William Hunter.
Robert Griffey Kennedy.
William Ernest Luse.
Charles Gilpin Manning.
Pinkney Lavater Ogle.
Louis Jeremiah Pollard.
Frederick Samuel Simmons.
Elmer Hill Simons.
Charles Spaulding Sly.
James Sweeney.
Edward Dwight Sykes.
Louis Llewellyn Tannev.

James Anthony Tremblay.
Revello Monroe Walker.
William Henry Williamson.

To be second lieutenants.

Wardlow Monroe Adams.
Richard Melsworth Alley.
Willard Mortimer Barton.
Thomas Pinkney Brittain.
John Henry Butler.
Horace Joseph Caterer.
George Porter Chase.
Jens Christensen.
Stanley Ailing Clark.
William Francis Coleman.
Omer Antonio Couture.
Frank Arthur Crawford.
Ralph Palmer Dolby.
Alexander Joseph Doray.
George Doyle.
George Arthur Ekman.
William Downing Evans.
Davidson McGill Fleming.
John Dennis Foley.
Manly Wingate Fort.
William Fredericks.
Bruce Dean Gill.
Frederick Gilmour.
Glen Dison Gorton.
Fred A. Harrison.
Alexander Hepburn.
Thomas Grimsley Hester.
Maurice Hicks.
Henry Holland.
Alfred Thompson Houck.
Berban Huffline.
Richard Ellsworth Humes.
Harry Milton Jennings.
William Harvey Kernan.
Charles Fellows Kimball.
Amos Stanhope Kinzer.
Robert Royal Linden.
Benjamin Ralph Luskomb.
Francis Edward Lynch.
Richard Homer McElwain.
William Thomas McKelvey.
Paul Andrew Mace.
Jesse Harper Mael.
Leo John Miller.
Martin Douglas Mims.
Francis Moore.
John Leo Morgan.
William McAdoo Murphree.
Homer Warrick Paxton.
Nealey Prater.
James Ault Ramsey.
Louis Ransom.
Harvey Israel Rice.
John Dillworth Schaefer.
John Charles Schwieger.
Fritz Jack Sheffer.
William Maxwell Smith.
Clyde Allison Speight.
Leslie Haward Stein.
Frank Steiner.
Everett Roscoe Stevens.
Harrison Lee Stockwell.
Max Verne Talbot.
Irving Eugene Tier.
Walter William Tobin.
John Albert Watfield.
Samuel Alfred Weir.
John Oliver Brown.
William Edmund Whelan.
Robert Newton Wilson.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Fred Herman Bloomhardt.
David Sturges Fairchild, jr.
Fielding Hudson Garrison.
Arthur Sylbert Pendleton.

To be majors.

Edward Johnson Abbott.
Darius Cleveland Absher.

Robert Aurand Allen.
Charles Lincoln Banks.
Edward Percy Beverley.
Allen Jackson Black.
Robert Abe Burns.
Reuben Adolphus Campbell.
Chauncey Leonard Chase.
Thomas Luther Coley.
Jirah Marston Downs.
Albert Gallatin Franklin.
Frank Nichols Green.
Lorin Arthur Greene.
Frank Runcorn Borden.
Daniel Joseph Hayes.
William Herbert Henry.
William Louis Hoffman.
Howard Hume.
George Boyden Jones.
Clyde Watkins Jump.
Edgar Smith Linthicum.
William George McKay.
Walter Fullarton Macklin.
Peter Duncan MacNaughton.
Herbert Clifford Mallory.
Omer Atherton Newhouse.
Henry Fanno Sawtelle.
Guthrie Eugene Scrutfield.
Thaddeus Sims Troy.
Frederick Arthur Van Buren.
Albert Nicholas Baggs.
Joseph Warren Bauman.
Edmund William Bayley.
Henry Shedd Beckford.
Charles Allen Betts.
William Otis Blanchard.
Jacob Carroll Bowman.
Gouverneur Hammeken Boyer.
Alexander Moultrie Brailsford.
Joseph Cushman Breitling.
Daniel Bradley Brinsmade.
Edgar Hayes Brown.
Roy Alton Brown.
Emil Henry Burgher.
Casper Ralph Byars.
Attilio Mario Caccini.
Douglas Walker Cairns.
William Allen Chapman.
Daniel Robert Chase.
Richard King Cole.
Arthur George Compton.
William Watson Conger.
Homer Leigh Conner.
James Francis Coupal.
Roy Herndon Cox.
Lewis Clyde Covington.
Albert Smith Dabney.
Christian Henry Dewey.
Clarence Eugene Drake.
John Francis Duckworth.
Francis Belmont Dwire.
Daniel Edward Egan.
Humphrey Newton Ervin.
William Knowles Evans.
Frank Doig Francis.
Fletcher Gardner.
Adolphe Mauger Giffin.
Edward Chace Greene.
Samuel Charles Gurney.
Milton Weston Hall.
Herbert Bill Hanson.
Joseph Storer Hart.
Ziba Lindley Henry.
Arthur Parker Hitchens.
Claude DuVall Holmes.
Clinton Luman Hoy.
Baxter Ross Hunter.
Lewis Edward Inman.
Arthur Dudley Jackson.
Ned Overton Lewis.
John Vincent Littig.
William Henry Lloyd.
John Pomfret Long.
Thomas Lee Long.
Raymond Force Longacre.
Charles Hubert Lovewell.
Arthur Lee Ludwick.

James A. Lyon.
 John Joseph McCormick.
 Alva Dutton Stearns McCoy.
 Charles Everett MacDonald.
 John Franklin McGill.
 John Joseph Mudigan.
 Irwin Beede March.
 Benjamin Joseph Marshall.
 Thomas Rollins Marshall.
 Charles Patrick Martin.
 William Hayes Mitchell.
 Herbert Bridger Montgomery.
 Roy Thomas Morris.
 Starr Abner Moulton.
 William Alexander Murphy.
 Bonaparte Preston Norvell.
 George Albert O'Connell.
 Roy Kimbrough Ogilvie.
 Harry Reeves Oliver.
 Bertram Henry Olmsted.
 Elbert Alonzo Palmer.
 Sam Fletcher Parker.
 Earl Lenwood Parmenter.
 Albro L. Parsons, jr.
 James Emory Phillips.
 Francis Herbert Poole.
 James Edwards Poore.
 James Frederick Presnell.
 Bertrand Dean Ridlon.
 Philander Chase Riley.
 David Michael Roberts.
 Fielding Tecumseh Robeson.
 William Fulford Sappington.
 Robert Baylor Shuckelford.
 Walter Stokes Sharpe.
 Charles Angell Shepard.
 Paul Richard Eddins Sheppard.
 Adam Edward Sherman.
 Herbert Homer Smith.
 Charles Granville Souder.
 Henry Newell Stilphen.
 Henry Kingsbury Stinson.
 Samuel Meredith Strong.
 Harrison Warner Stuckey.
 Armistead Keais Tayloe.
 Elton Lacroix Titus.
 Martillus Louis Todd.
 William Hitchcock Tukey.
 Walter Franz Von Zelinski.
 John Wallace.
 John Wade Watts.
 William Olendorf Wetmore.
 Joseph Meade White.
 Edward Lancaster Whittemore.
 William E. Wilmerding.
 Frank Ernest Winter.
 Carl Hamlin Witherell.
 Harry Gage Wyer.
 Albert Henry Eber.

To be captains.

Charles Arthur Bell.
 Alfred Morrell Bidwell.
 Aubrey Kenna Brown.
 James Sutton Brummette.
 Charles Beresford Callard.
 Daniel Currie Campbell.
 William Scott Dow.
 Charles Henry Haberer.
 Leonard Watson Hassett.
 Ralph Emerson Henry.
 Fred Earl Hickson.
 Daniel Cogdell Hutton.
 William Addison Jacques.
 Clyde Clifford Johnston.
 Henry Edgar Keeley.
 Robert Carnahan Kirkwood.
 William Joseph Leary.
 Ottis Like.
 Royal Shepherd Loving.
 John Ignatius Meagher.
 John Leonard Meddaugh.
 Fritz Joseph Moennighoff.
 Robert Cornelius Murphy.
 Oscar Winborne Nettles.
 Cyrenius Adelbert Newcomb.

James Bliss Owen.
 Arthur Calvin Rhine.
 Frank William Romaine.
 William Cooper Russell.
 George Joseph Schirch.
 Frank Noble Stiles.
 Dennis William Sullivan.
 Samuel L. Thorpe.
 Albert Julius Treichler.
 Henry Mitchell Van Hook.
 Harry Wall.
 David Walley.
 Silas Walter Williams.
 Stephen Hulbert Ackerman.
 Reginald Francis Annis.
 James Harvey Ashcraft.
 George Elliott Atwood.
 Cyrus Rexford Baker.
 Clyde McKay Beck.
 John Pierce Beeson.
 James Russell Bibighaus.
 Everard Blackshear.
 James Hubert Blackwell.
 Paul Newkirk Bowman.
 Ross Bradley Bretz.
 Henry Brooks.
 Samuel Elkan Brown.
 Charles Teackle Carter Buckner.
 Charles Ross Bullock.
 William John Burdell.
 Robert Morris Butler.
 Henry Alphonsus Callahan.
 Joseph Edward Campbell.
 Paul Gilbert Capps.
 Jose Canellas Carballeira.
 Thomas Morris Chaney.
 Otto Christian.
 Harry Ainsworth Clark.
 Shores Erastus Clinard.
 Ralph Elijah Cloward.
 Albion McDowell Coffey.
 Henry Samuel Cole.
 Clinton Franklin Costenbader.
 Thomas Byron Cracroft.
 Joseph Sherman Craig.
 James Edward Cramond.
 Walter Midkiff Crandall.
 Arthur Lee Davis.
 William Elijah Moore Devers.
 Ralph Duffy.
 Milo Benjamin Dunning.
 John Calvin Dye.
 John Fassett Edwards.
 Shirley Quincy Elmore.
 John Harry Evans.
 Merton Almond Farlow.
 Daniel Bascom Faust.
 Richmond Favour, jr.
 Daniel Webster Fetterolf.
 Harrison Horton Fisher.
 Lindsay Z. Fletcher.
 Harry Benjamin Forbes.
 Jesse Franklin Gamble.
 Charles Core Gans.
 Harry Baldwin Gantt.
 Claude Vernon Gautier.
 Ira James Gibson.
 John Shackelford Gibson.
 Adolph Thomas Gilhus.
 Emory Howard Gist.
 Stephen Harry Graham.
 Guy Granger.
 Joseph Henry Graves.
 Guy David Griggs.
 Malcolm Cummings Grow.
 James Gustin Hall.
 Martin Passmore Hamrick.
 Oscar Amadeus Hansen.
 Glenn Luther Harker.
 Virgil Anderson Harl.
 Ernest Farris Harrison.
 Clinton Harvey.
 Lewis Scott Harvey.
 Henry Wells Stanley Hayes.
 Harry Elton Hearn.

John Rutherford Herrick.
 George Earl Hesner.
 John Everett Hewitt.
 Burt Hibbard.
 John Samuel Hickman.
 Arthur Alvah Hobbs.
 Robert Wynne Horton.
 Howard Henry Howlett.
 Floyd William Hunter.
 Francis Beattie Hutton, jr.
 Henry Charles Johannes.
 Julius Admas Johnson.
 Henry Waters Kennard.
 William Bartle Kenworthy.
 Luther Holden Kice.
 Albert Glenn Kinberger.
 Erwin Warner Kleinman.
 Lewis Adolphus Lavanture.
 Milford Arthur Leach.
 Otis Williamson Little.
 Seth Anderson McConnell.
 Adolphus Alfred McDaniel.
 Patrick Joseph McKenzie.
 William Frank McLaughlin.
 Donald Murdock McRae.
 Hugh William Mahon.
 Louis Goodman Martin.
 Neely Cornelius Mashburn.
 Kirk Patrick Mason.
 John Archie Matson.
 Victor Newcomb Meddis.
 Charles Wilbur Metz.
 Hubert Livingstone Miller.
 Thomas Horace Miller.
 Louis Archie Milne.
 Pernier Albert Mix.
 Francis James Moffatt.
 Ernest Mariett Morris.
 Percy Daniel Moulton.
 William Daniel Mueller.
 David Ap Myers.
 Julius Girard Newgord.
 Richard James Newman.
 Danford Oatman.
 Sylvester Francis O'Day.
 Cleve Carrington Odom.
 Earl William O'Donnell.
 John Roy Oswalt.
 Marvin Chester Pentz.
 Earl Hunter Perry.
 Lawrence Bell Pilsbury.
 Oliver Henry Pinney.
 William Clare Porter.
 John Brewer Powers.
 Carroll Porteous Price.
 Herbert Hall Price.
 George Richard Randall.
 Thomas Harold Reagan.
 Frederick Talmage Rice.
 Durward Belmont Roach.
 Gaston Wilder Rogers.
 Philip Edward Rossiter.
 Horace Ewing Ruff.
 Harold Paine Sawyer.
 Carl William Shaffer.
 Edwin Forrest Shaffer.
 Bartlett Lockwood Shellhorn.
 Joseph Richards Shelton.
 Ralph Hayward Simmons.
 Richard Penn Smith.
 Leroy Dilmore Soper.
 Charles Booth Spruit.
 Donald Ion Stanton.
 Hubert Spencer Steenberg.
 Fred Oscar Stone.
 Edward Jones Strickler.
 Frank Paul Strome.
 Erick Martin Paulus Sward.
 Herbert Wellington Taylor.
 Robert Lancelot Tebbitt.
 Robert E. Thomas.
 Morris Hancock Tindall.
 Reeve Turner.
 Frank Cady Venn.
 John Bachop Warden.

Logan Mitchel Weaver.
 John Michael Weiss.
 Earl Howard Welcome.
 George Dillard Wells.
 George Brooks West.
 Lyle Charles White.
 William Monroe White.
 Joseph Hall Whiteley.
 Howard Tilghman Wickert.
 Daniel Benjamin Williams.
 John Mitchell Willis.
 Lee Hanville Winemiller.
 John Dawson Roswell Woodworth.
 Lucius Featherstone Wright.

To be first lieutenants.

Lewis Bradley Bibb.
 Wilbur Manson Blackshare.
 Henry Stevens Blesse.
 George Francis Cooper.
 John Paul Degnan.
 Martin Fred DuFrenne.
 Richard Henry Eanes.
 Arthur David Haverstock.
 Foster Cannon Howard.
 Linwood Melrose Keene.
 James Rhea McDowell.
 Joseph Ignatius Martin.
 Leland Oliver Walter Moore.
 Charles Robert Mueller.
 Ira Frederick Peak.
 Byron Johnson Peters.
 George Percy Rawls.
 Walter Clifton Royals.
 George Paul Sandrock.
 Charles Francis Shook.
 John Wilson Somerville.
 Harrison Morton Stewart.
 John Moorhaj Tamraz.
 Virgil Blackstone Williams.
 James Malone Bryant.
 Arthur Alexander Hobbs.
 Richard Turberville Arnest.
 James Franklin Arthur.
 Anthony Avata.
 Royal Rohan Baronidas.
 David Wade Bedinger.
 Lester Eastwood Beringer.
 Morgan Clint Berry.
 Dalmar Rowley Blakely.
 James Frank Brooke.
 Eli Edwin Brown.
 Hamilton Pope Calmes.
 Frank Tenney Chamberlin.
 Paul Christopher Christian.
 Francis Joseph Clune.
 William Shell Crawford.
 Clement Anthony Cummings.
 Charles Fletcher Davis.
 Alberto Garcia de Quevedo.
 William Presley Dingle.
 William Paul Dodds.
 Brooke Dodson.
 Arthur Wheeler Drew.
 Logan Illk Evans.
 Jaime Julian Figueras.
 William Thomas Fisher.
 James Morris Fontaine.
 Daniel Franklin.
 William Joseph Froitzheim.
 Othel Jefferson Gee.
 Anthony Joseph Greco.
 Francis William Gustites.
 Edward Cleveland Hagler.
 Walter Fleming Hamilton.
 Charles Vincent Hart.
 Adam George Heilman.
 William Humes Houston.
 Howard Joseph Hutter.
 Wilbur Gibson Jenkins.
 Barton Willard Johnson.
 Maxwell Gordon Keeler.
 Alexander Palmer Kelly.
 Aubin Tilden King.
 Harold Arthur Kirkham.

Claude Cyril Langley.
 George Edward Lindow.
 Alvin Clay McCall.
 Thomas Randolph McCarley.
 Bernard Anthony McDermott.
 Jesse Cartena McKean.
 Robert Malcolm.
 Henry William Meisch.
 Harry Ripley Melton.
 Joseph Aaron Mendelson.
 William Harvey Merriam.
 William John Mische.
 James Martin Miller.
 Alfred Mordecai.
 Robert Lee Peyton.
 Orlando Jefferson Posey.
 Elgen Clayton Pratt.
 Fabian Lee Pratt.
 Lincoln Frank Putnam.
 Samuel Winchester Reeves.
 George Edward Rehberger.
 Martin Robert Reiber.
 William Robert Lewis Reinhardt.
 George William Reyer.
 David Loren Robeson.
 Nathan Rosenberg.
 Oswald Felix Schiffli.
 Benjamin Tillman Sharpton.
 Clarence Ulm Snider.
 Carlton Culley Starkes.
 David Lloyd Stewart.
 Thomas Hill Stewart, jr.
 William LeRoy Thompson.
 Thomas Franklin Weldon.
 Ferdinand William Wiehe.
 George Thomas Wilhelm.
 Howard Moore Williamson.
 Raymond Clyde Wolfe.

DENTAL CORPS.

To be majors.

John M. Evey.
 Frederick Henry Saunders.

To be captains.

Waldo Johnson Adams.
 Albert Lea Alexander.
 Clyde William Allen.
 Roy L. Bodine.
 Daniel Brattan.
 Harold Howard Buehler.
 Thomas Joseph Cassidy.
 Daniel Joseph Crowley.
 Ernest Patton Dameron.
 Joseph E. Eden.
 James Boyle Harrington.
 Richard Curran Hughes.
 Victor Paul Klapacs.
 Robert Emmett Motley.
 Herbert Edward Frank Tiesing.
 Edwin St. Clair Wren.
 Charles Boothe Amis.

To be first lieutenants.

Emory Chester Bardwell.
 Arthur Edmon Brown.
 Vivian Z. Brown.
 Frank Alf Crane.
 Robert Clyde Craven.
 William Jay Crydermann.
 Milton Julius Damlos.
 Thomas Floyd Davis.
 Roy Ledbetter Denson.
 Albert Fields.
 Arthur Clay Foard.
 Earl George Gebhardt.
 Howard Austin Hale.
 Jay Ross Haskin.
 Clarence Walter Johnson.
 Edward James Kubesh.
 Herman James Lambert.
 Rufus Wood Leigh.
 Ralph Olds Leonard.
 Walter Duncan Love.
 Rollo Lown.
 Arthur Benedict McCormick.

Harry Theodore Ostrum.
 Willis Burleigh Parsons.
 Earle Robbins.
 John Samuel Ross.
 Everett Hale Ruggles.
 Hugh James Ryan.
 Melville Alexander Sanderson.
 William Elder Sankey.
 Ernest Frank Sharp.
 Victor Lee Shepard.
 William Swann Shuttleworth.
 Frank William Small.
 Arne Sorum.
 Thomas Luther Spoon.
 Roy Albert Stout.
 Oscar William Thompson.
 Lemuel Paul Woolston.
 William Joseph Adlington.
 Clarence Roy Benney.
 John Charles Burr.
 Charles Edward Callery.
 Leon Arthur Jones.
 James Barrett Mockbee.
 Clarence Constantin Olson.
 Stanley Rankin Rayman.
 Chauncey De Witt Van Alstine.
 Henry Allen Winslow.

VETERINARY CORPS.

To be captains.

Jacob Edward Behney.
 Edward Isaac Cheely.
 Nathan Newell Crawford.
 Jesse Daniel Derrick.
 Horace Samuel Eakins.
 Harold Edward Egan.
 Isaac Owen Gladish.
 Forrest Rutherford Harsh.
 Joseph Ernest Hodge.
 Harry Hathaway Howe.
 Raymond Alexander Kelser.
 James Roberts Mahaffy.
 Clell Bricker Perkins.
 Jean Rossman Underwood.
 Clifford Caswell Whitney.
 Christian William Greenlee.
 William Henry Houston.

To be first lieutenants.

Francis Michael Austin.
 Howard Newell Beeman.
 Thomas Alfred Breen.
 Burlin Chase Bridges.
 Lloyd John Brown.
 Kenneth Earl Buffin.
 Thomas Edward Carroll.
 Chauncey Edmund Cook.
 Charles Mansur Cowherd.
 Joseph Fenton Crosby.
 Seth C. Dildine.
 Oness Harry Dixon, jr.
 William Elmer Dodsworth.
 Joseph Patrick Gerety.
 Sawyer Adelbert Grover.
 Calvert Thomas Guilfoyle.
 Frank Caldwell Hershberger.
 Homer Johnson.
 Robert Patrick Kunnecke.
 Raymond Irvin Lovell.
 Martin Daniel Loy.
 John Knox McConeghy.
 Charles LeRoy Miller.
 John Wesley Miner.
 Albert John O'Grady.
 Clifford Eugene Pickering.
 Irby Rheuel Pollard.
 Mott Ramsey.
 Raymond Randall.
 Francois Hue Kari Reynolds.
 Philip Henry Riedel.
 Howard Mayo Savage.
 Harold Frederick Schreck.
 George Henry Seaver.
 Fred W. Shinn.
 Maximilian Siereveld, jr.
 Stanley Clifford Smock.

Frank Benjamin Steinkolk.
Ralph Brown Stewart.
Fred Chester Waters.
Charles Sears Williams.
Wallace Le Roy Williamson.
William Roy Wolfe.
Josiah Wistar Worthington.
George Jacob Rife.

To be second lieutenants.

James Lew Barringer.
Peter Thomas Carpenter.
Samuel Weir Clark.
Claude Francis Cox.
Joseph Hiram Dornblaser.
Gerald Woodward Fitz-Gerald.
Lloyd Manley Friedline.
Patrick Henry Hudgins.
William Orville Hughes.
Lester Wallace Ingram.
Gardiner Bouton Jones.
Samuel George Kielsmeier.
Earl Floyd Long.
John Richard Ludwigs.
Floyd Guy Martin.
Herbert Kelly Moore.
James Earl Noonan.
Walter Richard Pringle.
Edwin K. Rogers.
Oscar Charles Schwalm.
Raymond Thomas Seymour.
Russell Samuel Shannon.
Charles Bailey Skinner.
Harry E. Van Tuyl.
Harry Lawrence Watson.
Nathan Menzo Neate.

SIGNAL CORPS.

To be lieutenant colonel.

Frank Joseph Griffin.

To be major.

William Richards Blair.

To be captains.

Addis Bliss Albro.
James Gilbert Anthony.
Edwin Owen Baker.
Fred Guy Borden.
Thomas Denton Bowman.
Frank Warren Brown.
Albert Sawyer Bullens.
Charles Warren Chadbourne.
Thomas Lawrence Clark.
Murray Benjamin Dilley.
Robert Graham Forsythe.
Edward Frederick French.
Hamilton Hall Treager Glessner.
Ralph Richard Guthrie.
Edwin Chamberlayne Hall.
Raymond Clair Hildreth.
George Everett Hill, jr.
Guy Hill.
John Andrew Malterer.
Fred George Miller.
George Willis Morris.
Will Vermilya Parker.
Leon Henry Richmond.
Bertram John Sherry.
Livingston Swentzel.
Hugh Hartwell Temple.
James Wight Van Osten.
Robert Canada Vickers.
Harold William Webbe.
Alexander Efray Whitworth.
Clifford Debray Cuny.
Clay I. Hoppough.
Tom Christopher Rives.
Alfred Henry Thissen.
David Emery Washburn.
Charles Robert Welsh.
Robert Burdette Woolverton.

To be first lieutenants.

George Irving Back.
Frank Willard Bullock.
Calvin Halcombe Burkhead.
George Pollock Bush.

John James Downing.
Frank Ernest Eldredge.
Byron Adrian Falk.
Elwin Stewart Ferrand.
John Patrick Ferriter.
John Murphy Heath.
Hjalmar Bernhardt Hovde.
James Lawrence.
Edwin Rudolph Petzing.
Albert Milton Pigg.
Charles Maze Simpson, jr.
Chester Harvey Smith.
Clarence LeRoy Strike.
Ernest Andrew Thompson.
George Lincoln Townsend.
Ira Harry Treest.
Harry Louis Vitzthum.
Everett Roy Wells.
Fred Page Andrews.
Hardy Pate Browning.
Rolland Edward Stafford.

To be second lieutenants.

Carter Weldon Clarke.
Eugene Vincent Elder.
John Thomas Filgate.
Albert Joseph Lubbe.
Herbert Glendon Messer.
Paul LaRue Neal.
Howard Samuel Paddock.
Reis Joseph Ryland.
Theodore Thomas Teague.
Harold Farnsworth Hubbell.
Don McNeal.

AIR SERVICE.

To be captains.

Elmer Adler.
Truman Wike Allen.
William Alfred Bevan.
Thomas Boland.
Arthur Wellington Brock, jr.
Arthur Raymond Brooks.
Norbert Carolin.
Frederick Foster Christine.
Charles Palmer Clark.
Ernest Clark.
John Graham Colgan.
John Joseph Devery, jr.
Howard Thomas Douglas.
Harry Coleman Drayton.
Aubrey Irl Eagle.
Roscoe Fawcett.
Reuben Hollis Fleet.
Harrison William Flickinger.
Christopher William Ford.
Calvin Earl Giffin.
George Eustace Amyot Hallett.
Harold Evans Hartney.
Horace Nevil Heisen.
Lynwood Benjamin Jacobs.
George Churchill Kenney.
Louis Rodney Knight.
Edward Laughlin.
Eugene Lazar.
Francis Beatty Longley.
Allan Parker McFarland.
Dale Mabry.
William Charles Ocker.
Charles Thomas Phillips.
Edward Joseph Ralph.
Clearton Howard Reynolds.
Charles Merrill Savage.
David Sidney Seaton.
Floyd Newman Shumaker.
Albert Daniel Smith.
Harry Marcy Smith.
Lowell Herbert Smith.
Albert William Stevens.
William Frederick Volandt.
Harold Eastman Weeks.
Chillion Farrar Wheeler.
Henry Capron White.
John Garrett Whitesides.
Burdette Shields Wright.
Frank Wilbur Wright.

Byrne Virchow Baucom.
Harvey Weir Cook.
James Francis Doherty.
Charles George Eldson.
Oliver Stevenson Ferson.
Melvin Adams Hall.

To be first lieutenants.

Richard Thomas Aldworth.
William Valery Andrews.
Dogan Humphries Arthur.
Charles Bernard Austin.
Fred Austin.
Karl Shaffner Axtater.
Eugene Hoy Barksdale.
Frank Merrill Bartlett.
Eugene Benjamin Bayley.
Walter Bender.
Edward Crews Black.
Thomas Welch Blackburn.
Shiras Alexander Blair.
William Henry Bleakley.
Rowland Charles William Blessley.
Fred Sidney Borum.
Ulric Louis Bouquet.
Robert James Brown, jr.
Wallace Cole Burns.
Byron Turner Burt, jr.
Franklin Otis Carroll.
James Bernard Carroll.
William Henry Carthy.
Claire Lee Chennault.
John Martin Clark.
Ross Franklin Cole.
Carl William Connell.
Benedict Arthur Coyle.
Neal Creighton.
Isaiah Davies.
Raymond Ellis Davis.
Robin Alexander Day.
Charles Burton De Shields.
Harry Arden Dinger.
Benton Arthur Doyle.
Alonzo Maning Drake.
Donald George Duke.
Asa North Duncan.
Claude Edward Duncan.
Frederick Irving Eglin.
Merrick Gay Estabrook, jr.
Asa Jeremiah Etheridge.
Muir Stephen Fairchild.
Karl de Vries Fastenau.
Edward Lewis Fernsten.
Charles Rocheld Forrest.
Arthur Lee Foster.
Samuel Gordon Frierson.
Carl Brewer Fry.
Guy Harrison Gale.
Raynor Garey.
Alfred Clarence George.
Harold Huston George.
William Seymour Gravely.
William Andrew Gray.
Carl Franklin Greene.
Russell Molland Greenslade.
James Lionel Grisham.
Albert Michael Guidera.
Edward Higley Gullford.
Frank Denis Hackett.
Edward Meeker Haight.
Fraser Hale.
Joseph English Hall.
Harold Ross Harris.
Lloyd Leon Harvey.
William Albert Hayward.
James Andrew Healy.
Virgil Hine.
Earl Seeley Hoag.
Harlan Ware Holden.
Harvey Hodges Holland.
Richard Orleans Hunnam.
Leland Charles Hurd.
Don Lee Hutchins.
James Troy Hutchison.
Stephen Joseph Idzorek.
J. Thad Johnson.

Winant Pullis Johnston.
Aaron Edward Jones.
Edward Davis Jones.
Ulysses Grant Jones.
Clarence Peyton Kane.
Robert Kauch.
Frank Kehoe, jr.
John Carroll Kennedy.
Frederick Putnam Kenny.
Horace Simpson Kenyon.
Alvan Cleveland Kincaid.
Alfred Foster King, jr.
Richard James Kirkpatrick.
Leonidas Lee Koontz.
John Tollefson Lanfall.
Lawrence Augustus Lawson.
Walter Ralls Lawson.
Charles Manning Leonard.
Burton Frederick Lewis.
Martin Sidney Lindgrove.
Samuel Milhollen Lunt.
John Edward Lynch.
William Elmer Lynd.
John Michael McDonnell.
George Wilbur McEntire.
Frank Morton McKee.
John Arthur Macready.
Alfred Warrington Marriner.
Bruce North Martin.
Paul Jones Mathis.
Russell Lowell Maughan.
Charles Raymond Melin.
Clarence Lloyd Midcap.
Walter Miller.
Charles Hufford Mills.
John Isham Moore.
Edward Moses Morris.
Corliss Champion Moseley.
Langhorne Waldo Motley.
William Herbert Murphy.
Donald Patrick Muse.
Devereux Maitland Myers.
Clifford Cameron Nutt.
Robert Oldys.
Robert Sanford Olmsted.
Edwin Randolph Page.
George Merrill Palmer.
George Franklin Parris.
John Bellinger Patrick.
George Beatty Patterson.
Albert Brown Pitts.
Fred Place.
Leo Fred Post.
Rudolph William Propst.
Charles Addison Pursley.
Alfred Isaac Puryear.
Marion Gardner Putnam.
Merwyn Calvin Randall.
Walter Jay Reed.
Walter Hey Reid.
John Paul Richter.
Henry Irving Riley.
John Pierre Roullot.
Francis W. Ruggles.
Edwin Andrew Russell.
Phillip Schneeberger.
Earl Spiker Schofield.
John W. Shoptaw.
John William Signer.
Louis Charles Simon, jr.
Arthur Emel Simonin.
John William Slattery.
Kellogg Sloan.
Junius Augustus Smith.
Lotha August Smith.
Clifford Erle Smythe.
Martinus Stenseth.
Rex Kirkland Stoner.
Victor Herbert Strahm.
St. Clair Street.
Joseph Leonard Stromme.
Rene Raimond Studler.
Harry Allen Sutton.
Arthur Thomas.
Richard Edwin Thompson.

Julius Conrad Tips, jr.
 Otto Gresham Trunk.
 William Turnbull.
 Paul Roper Turpin.
 Frank Benjamin Tyndall.
 George Luke Usher.
 Arthur William Vanaman.
 Solomon Lee Van Meter, jr.
 John Parker Van Zandt.
 Raymond Edward Vaughan.
 Thomas Settle Voss.
 Perry Wainer.
 Henry Jay Ward.
 Harry Weddington.
 William Downing Wheeler.
 Ennis Clement Whitehead.
 Frederic Bernard Wieners.
 Donald Wilson.
 Walter Drake Williams.
 John Y. York, jr.
 Harry Herman Young.
 Morton Donald Adams.
 Max Balfour.
 Morris Berman.
 Halsey Lyle Bingham.
 Clayton Lawrence Bissell.
 Edmund Pendleton Gaines.
 Armin Ferdinand Herold.
 Frank O'Driscoll Hunter.
 Ira Robert Koenig.
 John McRae.
 Harry Gage Montgomery.
 Erik Henning Nelson.
 Bob Edward Nowland.
 Lawrence Irvin Peak.
 Laclair Davidson Schulze.
 Lorenzo Lamont Snow.
 Theose Elwin Tillinghast.
 LeRoy Moore Wightman.

To be second lieutenants.

Evers Abbey.
 James Ellsworth Adams.
 William Tillmon Agee.
 Ames Scribner Albrow.
 Frank Potter Albrook.
 Irwin Stuart Amberg.
 Stanley Mitchell Ames.
 William Noel Amis.
 Orvil Arson Anderson.
 Leland Stanford Andrews.
 James Francis Armstrong.
 Leslie Philip Arnold.
 Melvin B. Asp.
 Raphael Baez, jr.
 Joseph Popenjoy Bailey.
 Audrey Blaine Ballard.
 Gerald Edgar Ballard.
 Charles Yawkey Banfill.
 John DeForest Barker.
 Lloyd Barnett.
 Carl Henry Barrett.
 Harold Arthur Bartron.
 Lowell Whittier Bassett.
 Eugene Cooper Batten.
 Rosenham Beam.
 Harold Webster Beaton.
 Lucas Victor Beau, jr.
 Levi L. Beery.
 Dean Bryan Belt.
 John William Benton.
 Victor Emile Bertrandias.
 Cyrus Bettis.
 John Beveridge, jr.
 George Hendricks Beverley.
 Reuben Dallam Biggs.
 Roland Birnu.
 Hugh Albert Bivins.
 Lloyd Chartley Blackburn.
 John Blaney.
 Edwin Barton Bobzien.
 Howard Zabriskie Bogert.
 Carlton Foster Bond.
 Francis Pat Booker.
 Elmer John Bowling.
 William Lewis Boyd.

Harold Brand.
 Howard Carlton Brandt.
 Charles Egbert Branshaw.
 Charles Gage Brenneman.
 Wendell Holzworth Brookley.
 Thomas Brooks.
 Norman Delroy Brophy.
 Courtland Moshier Brown.
 George Harold Brown.
 Raymond Rudolph Brown.
 Donald Lloyd Bruner.
 George Howell Burgess.
 Walter Kellsey Burgess.
 Paul Edmund Burrows.
 Henry Thomson Burtis.
 Orin Jay Bushey.
 Roy William Camblin.
 Dwight Joseph Canfield.
 Edwin Forrest Carey.
 Hjalmar Frithjof Carison.
 Earle J. Carpenter.
 Harold Hibbard Carr.
 Samuel Oliver Carter.
 Warren Rice Carter.
 Benjamin Buckles Cassiday.
 Bernard Tobias Castor.
 Benjamin Shields Catlin, jr.
 Homer Barron Chandler.
 Charles Carl Chauncey.
 Wilfred Morey Clare.
 Harold Lyman Clark.
 Willard Shaw Clark.
 Laurens Claude.
 Ambrose Victor Clinton.
 James Culver Cluck.
 Gilbert Taylor Collar.
 Harry Forrest Colliver.
 William DeVoe Coney.
 Samuel Martin Connell.
 William Edmund Connolly.
 Frank Lauderdale Cook.
 Russell Hay Cooper.
 John D. Corkille.
 Carl Anson Cover.
 John Sanderson Crawford.
 George Good Cressey.
 Harrison Gage Crocker.
 Robert Theodore Cronau.
 Clarence Edgar Crumrine.
 Charles Milton Cummings.
 Wallace Caldwell Cummings.
 James Thomas Curry, jr.
 Clarence Meredith Cutler.
 Burnie Raymond Dallas.
 Joseph Henry Davidson.
 Rufus Benjamin Davidson.
 John Myrddin Davies.
 Everett Sanford Davis.
 Lewis Allegeo Dayton.
 William Windom Dixon.
 James Harold Doolittle.
 Charles Douglas.
 Charles Hale Dowman.
 Hugh Chester Downey.
 John Raymond Drumm.
 James Edward Duke, jr.
 Lionel H. Dunlap.
 Ray Aloysious Dunn.
 Delmar Hall Dunton.
 John McDonough Early.
 James Sharp Eldredge.
 Carl Grammer Eliason.
 Clifford Elleman.
 Louis North Eller.
 Charles Glendower Ellicott.
 Marion Larimore Elliott.
 Sam Love Ellis.
 Arthur Ignatius Ennis.
 Eugene Lowry Eubank.
 Charles Reed Evans.
 William Cushman Farnum.
 Robert Halbert Finley.
 Matthew Edward Finn.
 Clyde Virginius Finter.
 Fred Cleveland Fishback.

Donald David Fitzgerald.
 William Stephen Fitzpatrick.
 James Flannery.
 Wallace Robinson Fletcher.
 Angier Hobbs Foster.
 Thad Victor Foster.
 Albert Carl Foulk.
 Russell Ralph Fox.
 Elbert Wiley Franklin.
 Kenneth Gatiss Fraser.
 Wallis Ammi Frederick.
 Ezra Rice Frost, jr.
 William Carl Gabriel.
 Dale Vincent Gaffney.
 Grandison Gardner.
 John Henry Gardner.
 Kenneth Garrett.
 Byron Elihu Gates.
 Harold Lee George.
 Charles Willard Getchell.
 Ralph Alfonzo Gibson.
 Thomas Lonnie Gilbert.
 Barney McKinney Giles.
 Benjamin Franklin Giles.
 James Douglas Givens.
 John Raglan Glascock.
 Edgar Eugene Glenn.
 George William Goddard.
 William Campbell Goldsborough.
 Donald Reuben Goodrich.
 Wendell Eugene Goodrich.
 Oliver Perry Gothlin, jr.
 Oliver Allen Gottschalk.
 Gilbert Shaw Graves, jr.
 Carlyle West Graybeal.
 Jack Greer.
 Gerald Edward Grimes.
 Karl Derby Guenther.
 Faye Sherman Gullet.
 James Weston Hammond.
 John Robert Hall.
 Spencer Hall.
 Harry Arthur Halverson.
 Arthur Girard Hamilton.
 Winfield Scott Hamlin.
 William Jones Hanlon.
 Edward Vincent Harbeck.
 Ernest Emery Harmon.
 Ray Guy Harris.
 John Vernon Hart.
 Harrison Jay Hartmen.
 George William Haskins.
 Thomas Watson Hasty.
 Caleb Vance Haynes.
 Grissom Edward Haynes.
 Robert Storie Heald.
 Albert Faltoute Hebbard.
 Armor Simpson Hefley.
 Albert Francis Hegenberger.
 Lawrence Pradere Hickey.
 Edward Ernest Hildreth.
 Ployer Peter Hill.
 Edward Alton Hillery.
 Harold Kirkham Hine.
 Stacy C. Hinkle.
 George Edwin Hodge.
 James Pratt Hodges.
 Park Holland.
 John Benjamin Holmberg.
 Frederick Mercer Hopkins, jr.
 Bushrod Hopplin.
 Charles Adam Horn.
 Aubrey Hornsby.
 Clarence Frost Horton.
 Walter Bernard Hough.
 Charles Harold Howard.
 Ernest LeRoy Hurst.
 Silas Clearman Hyndshaw.
 Thomas Vincent Hynes.
 Robert Victor Ignico.
 Edward Jenkins.
 Alfred Liljevalch Jewett.
 Arthur Lowell Johnson.
 Bayard Johnson.
 Cortlandt Spencer Johnson.
 Edwin Johnson.
 George Pryor Johnson.
 Harry Anton Johnson.
 Douglas Johnston.
 Delbert Emerick Jones.
 James Bumer Jordan.
 Rupert Julian.
 John A. Kase.
 Oakley George Kelly.
 Emile Tisdale Kennedy.
 Cornelius John Kenney.
 Emil Charles Kiel.
 Everett Listeman Kirkpatrick.
 Ross Corbett Kirkpatrick.
 Guy Kirksey.
 Robert Duane Knapp.
 Theodore Joseph Koenig.
 Henry William Kunkel.
 Clyde Antone Kuntz.
 Arthur Kay Ladd.
 John Arthur Laird, jr.
 William Michael Lanagan.
 Sigmund Franklin Landers.
 Westside Torkel Larson.
 Newman Raiford Laughinghouse.
 John Theodore Lawson.
 Malcolm Stoney Lawton.
 Royal Beard Lea.
 Richard Kemp LeBrou.
 Edgar Andrew Liebhauser.
 Arthur George Liggett.
 Alfred Lindeburg.
 David Glenn Lingle.
 Clarence Beaver Lober.
 Newton Longfellow.
 George Godfrey Lundberg.
 Floyd Albert Lundell.
 Frederick Dan Lynch.
 Alfred Jefferson Lyon.
 Hez McClellan.
 John Myers McCulloch.
 Roger Shaw McCullough.
 Milo McCune.
 Corley Perry McDarment.
 Cleveland William McDermott.
 George Clement McDonald.
 Russell Carrigan MacDonald.
 Jasper Kemper McDuffie.
 Harold Ailing McGinnis.
 Kenneth Campbell McGregor.
 George Allan McHenry, jr.
 Michael Everett McHugo.
 Clarence Roscoe MacIver.
 William John McKiernan, jr.
 Ashley Chadbourne McKinley.
 Morton Howard McKinnon.
 Guy Lewis McNeil.
 George Vardeman McPike.
 Edwin Ray McReynolds.
 Jesse Anthony Madarasz.
 Richard Hartnett Magee.
 Lester James Maitland.
 Louie Clifford Mallory.
 Merrill Deitz Mann.
 Earle Henry Manzelman.
 Austin Walrath Martenstein.
 Pardoe Martin.
 Harry Joseph Martin.
 Thomas Kennedy Matthews.
 Warren Arthur Maxwell.
 William Riley Maynard.
 Arthur John Melanson.
 Vincent James Meloy.
 Phillips Melville.
 Bennett Edward Meyers.
 Leland Wilbur Miller.
 Harry Hobson Mills.
 Pittman Wall Mills.
 Samuel Perham Mills.
 Raymond Calvin Milyard.
 Hugh Cromer Minter.
 Reuben Curtis Moffat.
 James Alexander Mollison.
 John William Monahan.
 Charles Norton Monteith.
 Oscar Monthan.

Odas Moon.
 Robert Dudley Moor.
 Harold Amos Moore.
 William Grayson Moore.
 Ivan Glen Moorman.
 William King Moran.
 John Ross Morgan.
 Louis Philip Moriarty.
 Joseph Theodore Morris.
 William Colb Morris.
 Raymond Morrison.
 Charles Lester Morse.
 Benjamin Rhoten Morton.
 Roy Bradford Mosher.
 Max Frederic Moyer.
 Carl Hiestand Myers.
 James Montrose Graham Thomson Neely.
 Fred Cyrus Nelson.
 Frederick William Niedermeyer, jr.
 Omer Osmer Niergarth.
 Erling Schriver Norby.
 Howard Dutton Norris.
 Jack Joseph O'Connell.
 Myron Emmett O'Hanly.
 Roderick Norman Ott.
 Ray L. Owens.
 George William Pardy.
 Frederick Irving Patrick.
 Frank Martyn Paul.
 Alexander Pearson, jr.
 John Millan Pennewill.
 Elmer Daniel Perrin.
 Wendell Kingsley Phillips.
 Joseph Allen Physioc, jr.
 Younger Arnold Pitts.
 Maril James Plumb.
 George Washington Polk, jr.
 Edward Michael Powers.
 Paul Hyde Prentiss.
 Walter Emmett Price.
 Charles Peter Prime.
 Ivan Lewis Proctor.
 Harvey William Prosser.
 Carl Weston Pyle.
 Edward Whiting Italey.
 Howard Knox Ramey.
 William Millican Randolph.
 Mark Henry Redman.
 Lewis Rinehart Pfoutz Reese.
 Dache McClain Reeves.
 Henry Harold Reilly.
 George Edgar Rice.
 Walter Eugene Richards.
 Carlyle Howe Ridenour.
 William Edward Riley.
 Harold Rentsch Rivers.
 Oliver Kendall Robbins.
 George Oliver Roberson.
 Ward Fisk Robinson.
 Oscar Leslie Rogers.
 Harold Franklyn Rouse.
 Dudley Ely Rowland.
 Graham Mead St. John.
 Glenn Charles Salisbury.
 Max Frank Schneider.
 Ned Schramm.
 Edward Lewis Searl, jr.
 Frank Walter Seifert.
 Robert Elmer Self.
 Edgar Theodore Selzer.
 Henry Few Sessions.
 Clayton Charles Shangraw.
 Clarence Edward Shankle.
 Leon Edgar Sharon.
 Hiram Wilson Sheridan.
 James Cole Shively.
 Hubert Augustine Shovlin.
 Peter Emanuel Skanse.
 Charles Theodore Skow.
 Harold Daniel Smith.
 Stanley Smith.
 Stanton Thomas Smith.
 Talcott Proudman Smith.
 Wallace Gordon Smith.
 George William Snow.

William Bettencourt Souza.
 Harry Leon Speck.
 Owen Evans Spruance.
 Orville L. Stephens.
 Malcolm Nebeker Stewart.
 Donald Gardner Stitt.
 Charles Wesley Sullivan.
 Joseph Ignatius Sullivan.
 William Robert Sweeley.
 James Gradon Taylor.
 Willis Ratcliffe Taylor.
 John Parr Temple.
 Charles Edwin Thomas, jr.
 Bernard Scott Thompson.
 Arthur Leslie Thornton.
 Earle Hayden Tonkin.
 Bernard Joseph Tooher.
 Stewart Wellington Torney.
 George Platt Tourtellot.
 Morris Langdon Tucker.
 Stanley Milward Umstead.
 John Edwin Upston.
 Theodore Schafer Van Veghten.
 Joseph Edwin Virgin.
 Leigh Wade.
 Paul Theodore Wagner.
 Kenneth Newton Walker.
 Alfred Evans Waller.
 LeRoy Allen Walthall.
 Charles William Walton.
 Thomas Harrison Ward.
 Arthur Gillette Watson.
 Dayton Dudley Watson.
 Charles Leland Webber.
 Lewis Selwyn Webster.
 Robert Morris Webster.
 Leonard Dickson Weddington.
 Clarence Herbert Welch.
 Harold Ralph Wells.
 William Warren Welsh.
 Frank Edward White.
 William Joseph White.
 John Frederick Whiteley.
 Courtney Whitney.
 Paul California Wilkins.
 Isaac Jackman Williams.
 John Gordon Williams.
 Paul Langdon Williams.
 Clarence Chamberlin Wilson.
 John Harvey Wilson.
 Joseph Alexis Wilson.
 Kenneth Bonner Wolfe.
 Leroy Marion Wolfe.
 Edward Huffner Wood.
 Norman Reuben Wood.
 Jacob Marcellus Woodard.
 James Atwater Woodruff.
 Fred Evans Woodward.
 Henry Guy Woodward.
 Mark Rhey Woodward.
 Henry Edward Wooldridge.
 Clinton Fisk Woolsey.
 Robert Strong Worthington.
 John Brandon Wright.
 Roscoe Caleb Wriston.
 John Albert Wyatt.
 Wesley A. Zellner.
 Alfred Baxter Baker.
 Oscar Norvell Barney.
 Joseph Williams Benson.
 Oliver Wendell Broberg.
 Thomas John Carroll.
 Milo Neil Clark.
 William Burleigh Clarke.
 Howard Arnold Craig.
 Samuel Custer Eaton, jr.
 Solomon Bernard Ebert.
 Welcome Bridges Elston.
 Frederick William Evans.
 Benjamin Franklin Griffin.
 Harold Patrick Hennessy.
 Leland Ross Hewitt.
 Maurice Sheftad Hill.
 Roland Everett Hill.
 Fonda Bernard Johnson.

James Joseph Langin.
 Adolphus Rankin McConnell.
 Wendell Brown McCoy.
 Clements McMullen.
 Walter Thomas Meyer.
 Valentine Stone Miner.
 Horace William Mooney.
 Francis Warren Nunenmacher.
 Edward Morris Robbins.
 Charles McKinley Robinson.
 Roland Lester Spencer.
 Charles William Steinmetz.
 David Robert Stinson.
 Edwin Sullivan.
 William Simmons Sullivan.
 Clarence Prescott Talbot.
 Willard Spencer Wade.
 Myron Ray Wood.
 Robert Theodore Zane.
 Frederick Andrew Johnson.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE.

To be majors.

Benjamin Almond Brackenbury.
 Arthur Milton Heritage.
 Charles Leveque Joly.
 Henry Hubert Stickney, jr.

To be captains.

Edward Bates Blanchard.
 James Helmus Bogart.
 Arthur Cobb.
 Lewis Spann Lathier.
 Lewis Mitchell McBride.
 John Gibbon McCoy.
 John Andrews MacLaughlin.
 Ovid Eli Roberts, jr.
 Edward Cyrus Thompson.
 William Ward Wise.
 Edward Wolesensky.

To be first lieutenants.

Joseph Franklin Battley.
 Hubert Butler Bramlet.
 Guy Louis Chamberlin.
 Patrick Francis Craig.
 Lowell Allison Elliott.
 Harry Albert Kuhn.
 Harry Ruhl Ledkicher.
 George Alfred Mackay.
 Charles Samuel Moyer.
 Hugh Williamson Rowan.
 Howard Stokes.
 Murray Charles Wilson.
 John Harvey Becque.
 Edmund Gerald Steis.
 Frederick John Swanson.
 Alden Harry Waitt.

To be second lieutenants.

Maurice Edgar Jennings.
 Shelby Newton Griffith.
 Fred Murdoch Henley.
 Harold Albert Pelton.
 John George Shannonhouse.
 Paul Revere Smith.
 Ralph Hamilton Tate.
 Matthew Ebbert Webber.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be lieutenant colonel.

George Lloyd Wall.

To be majors.

Keith Frazee Adamson.
 John Kay Clement.
 Richard Hays Hawkins.
 George Wellington Graham.
 Albert Emile Guy.
 John Herbert Hunter.
 George Francis Lemon.
 John Quincy MacDonald.
 Watson Moses Myers.
 Patrick Joe O'Shaughnessy.
 Oliver Hyde Presbrey.
 Henry Lawson Rice.

Henry Hunter Kimball Sheridan.
 Roger Taylor.
 Charles Henry Traeger.
 Sidney Smith Underwood.
 Edwin Hyde Chase, jr.
 Mervyn Paul Randolph.
 Charles Mason Roberts.

To be captains.

John Edward Brown.
 Harold Witter Churchill.
 Stuart Cooper.
 James Stevenson Crawford.
 Lemuel Paul Crim.
 Stewart Hancock Elliott.
 David St. Pierre Gaillard.
 James Anderson Beirne Gibson.
 Elmer Conrad Goebert.
 Walter Thomas Gorton.
 Samuel Gordon Green.
 Dale Clarence Hall.
 Walter Clarence Hamilton.
 James Briggs Haney.
 John Palmer Harris.
 Guy Russell Hartrick.
 William James Henry.
 Thomas Wyatt Holmes.
 John Lee Hughes.
 Joseph Alvis Long.
 Fred Anthony McMahon.
 Reynold Ferdinand Melin.
 Norris Whitlock Osborn.
 Dwight Partridge.
 William Vincent Randall.
 Charles Summer Reed.
 Claudius Henry Mastin Roberts.
 Asa Herman Skinner.
 Newton Harrell Strickland.
 John Aubrey Wheeler.
 Frank Blakeslee Wallace.
 Harold Street Wilkins.
 James Brayshaw Arthur.
 Clarence Barnard.
 Gregory Sumner Lavin.
 John Allen Root.
 Charles Allen Watkins.

To be first lieutenants.

Joseph Lawrence Aman.
 George Raymond Ensminger.
 Fred Ivan Gilbert.
 David Nathaniel Hauseman.
 Charles Edwin Lex, jr.
 Royal Barton Libby.
 Henry Earl Minton.
 Joseph Worthen Proctor.
 Charles Earl Whitney.
 Heman Bangs Wilson, jr.
 Arthur Dana Elliot.
 Harold Alfred Willis.

To be second lieutenants.

Marshall Eugene Darby.
 Richard Law Hubbell.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be lieutenant colonel.

William Charles Weeks.

To be majors.

John Soule Butler.
 Harry Frank Cameron.
 Malcolm Elliott.
 William Henry Lanagan.
 Leon Elie Lyon.
 Paul Reisinger.
 Elihu Harrison Ropes.
 Harry Montague Trippe.
 Frank Russell Weeks.
 Herbert Joseph Wild.
 James Warren Bagley.
 William Burr Harrison.
 Wallace Whitney Kirby.
 William Caswell Lemen.
 Charles Edwards Perry.

To be captains.

Clay Anderson.
 James David Andrews, jr.
 Fred Thomson Bass.
 Edward North Chisolm, jr.
 Philip Thayer Coffey.
 Robert Morris Copeland.
 William Henry Crosson.
 Samuel Lyman Damon.
 John Gardiner Drinkwater.
 Adolphe St. Armand Fairbanks.
 Charles Brackett Falley.
 George Albert Geib.
 Lewis Coleman Gordon.
 Schenk Henry Griffin.
 William Eldon Harris.
 Robert Charles Hunter.
 Clarence Sylvester Jarvis.
 Samuel Nairn Karrick.
 William Sawtelle Kilmer.
 John Goulding Little.
 Leonard Lundgren.
 Harold Chandos Lyons.
 Hugh Miller.
 Frank Winder Moore.
 Everett Bodman Murray.
 Hugh Pigott Oram.
 Theodore Bissell Parker.
 Alva Harold Perkins.
 Albert Woodbridge Pioda.
 Robert Armstrong Radford.
 Harrie Dean W. Riley.
 Chester Abhram Rothwell.
 David McDougald Shearen.
 Roland Henry Stock.
 Harry Ogle Tunis.
 Elliott Vandevanter.
 Harry Briggs Vaughan, jr.
 Theodore Wyman, jr.
 Howard McClymonds Yost.
 John Frank Zajicek.
 Alexander Seymour Ackerman.
 Leroy Webster Cummings.
 Edward Henry Dignowity.
 Pier Luigi Focardi.
 George William Gillette.
 Harold Samuel Gillette.
 William Vilas Hill.
 Kenneth Swank Jones.
 John Edward Langley.
 Thomas Harold Messer.
 Henry Bolton Post.
 Richard Landrum Smith.
 Charles Humphrey Swick.
 Stephen Carson Whipple.
 Herbert Clinton Whitehurst.

To be first lieutenants.

Roy Prentice Bishop.
 Charles William Burlin.
 Heston Rarick Cole.
 Robert Francis Gill.
 Roy William Grower.
 Ellis Edward Haring.
 Bruce Craighill Hill.
 Harry Wright Hill.
 Ole Gunnar Hoas.
 James Francis Clark Hyde.
 Albert Barnett Jones.
 Albert Lossen Lane.
 Merrifield Graham Martling.
 Albertis Montgomery.
 Lewis Andrew Pick.
 Bernard Smith.
 Willson Young Stamper, jr.
 Joseph Hemsley Stevenson.
 John Canning Wade.
 Maybin Homes Wilson.
 Walter Alexander Wood, jr.
 Clinton William Ball.
 Gordon Cushing Day.
 Paul Miller Ellman.
 Edwin Paul Ketchum.
 Robert Harry Tompkins.
 William Hamelton Wheeler.
 Reading Wilkinson.

To be second lieutenants.

Philip Gilstrap Bruton.
 Robert Emmet Coughlin.
 Clifton Tredway Hunt.
 Horace Leland Porter.
 Homer B. Pettit.
 James Barlow Cullum, jr.
 Francis Hudson Oxx.
 Thomas Henry Stanley.
 Donald Greeley White.
 Henry George Lambert.
 William Weston Bessell, jr.
 Charles George Holle.
 Charles Sheafe Joslyn.
 Arthur Martin Andrews.
 Edward Crosby Harwood.
 John Wylie Moreland.
 Wayne Stewart Moore.
 Henry Franklin Hannis.
 Arthur Lee McCullough.
 Arthur Vinton Linwood James.

CHAPLAINS.

To be chaplain with rank of lieutenant colonel.

Charles C. Pierce.

To be chaplains with rank of captain.

Horace Requa Fell.
 Orville E. Fisher.
 John Victor Axton.
 Joel Russel Benjamin.
 Edward Larose Branham.
 Orville Irvin Clappitt.
 Thomas George Conboy.
 John Thomas De Bardeleben.
 William Loren Fisher.
 Clifford Paynter Fletcher.
 Charles Frederic Graeser.
 Frank Hallie Hayes.
 Jefferson Fletcher Isbell.
 Peter Joseph Kilkenny.
 Francis Marion McCoy.
 Samuel Johnson Miller.
 Louis Henri Phaneuf.
 Aristeo Vincent Simoni.
 Thomas Edward Swan.
 Emerson Etherage Swanson.
 Earl Henry Weed.

To be chaplains with the rank of first lieutenants.

Garrett Le Roy Allen.
 Harlan Judson Ballentine.
 Ivan Loveridge Bennett.
 Frederick John Bergs.
 Reuben Earl Boyd.
 William Roy Bradley.
 Berton Frederick Bronson.
 John Joseph Byrne.
 John Joseph Campbell.
 Monroe Starkey Caver.
 William Donoghue Cleary.
 Philip Francis Coholan.
 Cornelius Aloysius Corcoran.
 Samuel Eugene Crosby.
 John W. Daily.
 Ralph Conrad Deibert.
 Walter John Donoghue.
 James E. Duffy.
 Albert Leslie Evans.
 William Henry Fowle.
 Joseph Gail Garrison.
 Joseph Appleton Gray.
 Frank Bacon Hart.
 Hal Coleman Head.
 Willis Timmons Howard.
 Elmer Alfred Huset.
 Samuel Barcus Knowles.
 Edward Erie Lane.
 Pierre H. Levesque.
 James L. McBride.
 Thomas Lawrence McKenna.
 Frank Pearson MacKenzie.
 C. Arthur MacLeod.
 George Jefferson McMurry.
 John MacWilliams.
 Cornelius Aloysius Maher.
 Mylon Dickinson Merchant.

Frank Lewis Miller.
 Luther D. Miller.
 John F. Monahan.
 Faye Arnold Moon.
 Roy Hartford Parker.
 James Hybert Pollard.
 Peter Joseph Quinn.
 Charles Snell Rahn.
 Oscar Whitefield Reynolds.
 Herbert A. Rinard.
 Theodore Franklin Rudisill.
 Paul Bertram Rupp.
 Edmund Charles Sliney.
 Harry Dubois Southard.
 Edward Lytton Spaulding.
 Jodie Gibson Stewart.
 Earl Mauritius Stigers.
 Benjamin Joseph Tarskey.
 Edgar Nathaniel Thorn.
 Ralph Howard Tibbals.
 Edward Lewis Trett.
 Mariano Vassallo.
 Albert Floyd Vaughan.
 Henry Russell Westcott, jr.
 Perry O. Wilcox.
 Guy Herold Wilson.
 Samuel Otto Wright.
 John Knox Bodel.
 Frank Burton Bonner.
 Edwin Burling.
 Charles W. B. Hill.
 Archibald Augustus Lancaster.
 Ivan Gochnauer Martin.
 Maurice William Reynolds.
 Ralph Winfred Rogers.
 Frederick Christian Sager.
 Gynther Storaasli.
 Robb White, jr.
 Commodore Robert Watkins.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be majors.

Samuel Townsend Stewart.
 Edward Warden Turner.

To be captains.

Walter Holbrook Adams.
 George Walcott Ames.
 Victor Reinhold Anderson.
 Delbert Ausmus.
 Ernest Russ Barrows.
 George Blaney.
 Harold Borden Bliss.
 Louis James Bowler.
 William Carrick Braly.
 Charles Simonton Brice.
 Arthur Wentworth Burton.
 William Robert Carlson.
 Arthur Kay Chambers.
 Howard Foster Clark.
 Robert Mason Connell.
 Frederic Webster Cook.
 Chauncey Loren Cooke.
 Richard Ernest Dupuy.
 Franklin Eugene Edgecomb.
 Walter Carroll Ellis.
 Louis Duzzett Farnsworth.
 Harold Lancelot Finley.
 Ralph Regula Geltz.
 Walter James Gilbert.
 Vernon Webster Hall.
 Philip William Hardie.
 Walter Hart.
 Albert Adkins Hedge.
 James Hunter.
 Reginald Johnston Imperator.
 Harold Sidney Johnson.
 Rodney Campbell Jones.
 Creighton Kerr.
 Samuel Robert Kimble.
 Claude Lesley Kishler.
 Rolla Valentine Ladd.
 Norbert Cecil Manley.
 John Emerson Matthews.
 Michael Joseph Moore.
 Albert Mossman.

Harry Womersley Ostrander.
 Thomas Raymond Parker.
 Marvel Harold Parsons.
 Earl Ransom Reynolds.
 Dorsey Jay Rutherford.
 Joseph Francis Stiley.
 Edward Henry Taliaferro, jr.
 Phillip Dunbar Terry.
 Joseph Twyman.
 Arthur Wilson Waldron.
 Martin Clinton Walton, jr.
 Ellis Donald Weigle.
 George Walter Whybark.
 John Harold Wilson.
 Joseph M. Cole.
 Gustaf Ericson.
 Francis James Fitzpatrick.
 Robert Neville Mackin, jr.

To be first lieutenants.

Percy Adams.
 Charles Henry Ainsworth.
 George Henry Bardsley.
 Ben Butler Blair.
 Walter Fowler Bonnel.
 Kenneth Clarke Bonney.
 Harry Innes Borden.
 Napoleon Boudreau.
 Orley De Forest Bowman.
 Clarence Eugene Brand.
 William Gregory Brey.
 Ellis Warren Butt.
 Edwin C. Callicutt.
 Frederick Rockwell Chamberlain, jr.
 John Richard Clark.
 Thomas Leavey Cleaver.
 Harrington Willson Cochran.
 Morris Easton Conable.
 Rene Edward deRussy.
 James Gasper Devine.
 Elmer Theodore Foss.
 Valentine Pearsall Foster.
 Harry Joseph Gaffney.
 Chauncey Alfred Gillette.
 Walter Ray Goodrich.
 Donald Buckingham Greenwood.
 Alexander Leroy Haggart.
 John Henry Harrington.
 John Ephraim Harrison.
 Norman Earl Hartman.
 John Healy, jr.
 Roger Sherman Hoar.
 Allan Johnson.
 John Joseph Johnson.
 Allison Ware Jones.
 William Camillus Kabrich.
 Donald Campbell Kemp.
 Frederick Harrison Koerbel.
 Fabius Henry Kohloss.
 Arthur Leo Lavery.
 Merle Clifford Leonard.
 Frederick Lofquist.
 Regeon Victor Love.
 Robert Wilkin McBride.
 Samuel Overton McCue.
 John James Maher.
 William Richard Maris.
 William Frederic Marquat.
 Alfred Carleton Moeller.
 Don Richman Norris.
 Joseph James Pire.
 John Austin Pixley.
 Woodson Rhein.
 Frank Richards.
 Caesar Rodney Roberts.
 Victor Schmidt.
 Henry Hardy Slicer.
 Adrin Bruno Smith.
 Harold W. Smith.
 Verne Clair Snell.
 Edgar Peter Sorensen.
 Lessley Eugene Spencer.
 Philip Boswell Taliaferro.
 James Richard Townsend.
 Joseph Benjamin Varela.
 Fred Brenning Waters.

Edward Barclay Wharton.
Herbert Winterburn.
Arthur Vanderpool Winton.
Volney Winfield Wortman.
Herbert Hatchett Blackwell.
Fred William Crisp.
Frank Adolphus Hollongshead.
Thomas Joseph Johnston.
Otta Marshall.
Everard Franklin Olsen.
James Allen Ryan.
Frederick Philip Schlandt.
Louis Howard Thompson.

To be second lieutenants.

Christian Stephen Andersen.
Roy Thomas Barrett.
James Hiram Bedford.
Clarence Omer Bell.
Philip Frederick Biehl.
Abraham Lincoln Bullard.
Geoffrey Cooke Bunting.
Walter Hannum Carlisle.
James Lindley Coman.
Louis Ogden Davis.
Charles Stevenson Denny.
Ray Edward Dingeman.
Porter Tate Gregory.
William Ernest Griffin.
Ralph Eldon Harrington.
Linton Yates Hartman.
Raymond Adelbert Knapp.
Donald Dakin Lamson.
Theodore Julius Lindorff.
Richard Cohron Lowry.
Harry Frederick Meyers.
Harold Hopkins Miller.
Charles Mellis Myers.
George Franklin Nichols.
Hewitt Warren Richmond.
James Merrill Robinson.
Cyrus Quinton Shelton.
James Howard Smith.
James Oliver Smithley.
Rupert Edison Starr.
Andrew Paul Sullivan.
James Desmond Summers.
Henry Walter Ulmo.
William Byron Walters.
William Henry Webb.
Walter Leo Weible.
Arthur Edmond Wilson.
Willis Lamar Claxton.
George James Burns Fisher.
Elmer Warren Miller.
Ralph Jacob Mitchell.
Oal Aloysius Nelson.
William H. Papenfoth.
Thomas Patrick Walsh.
Wilson Burnett Higgins.
Frederic Lord Hayden.
Warren Cressman Rutter.
Harold Thomas Miller.
Volney Archer Poulson.
William Chamberlaine Coe.
Robert Henry Vickery Stackhouse.
James Goodrich Renno.
Loper Bailey Lowry.
Lee Armstead Denson, jr.
Ewart Gladstone Plank.
Alexander Romeyn MacMillan.
James Vincent Walsh.
Lathrop Ray Bullene.
Joseph Eugene Harriman.
Coleman Romain.
George Joseph Loupret.
Morrison Page Chitterling.
John Loren Goff.
Robert Barrett Donnelly.
William Gordon Holder.
Halstead Clotworthy Fowler.
Lyman Louis Lemnitzer.
Charles Himmeler.
John States Seybold.
Donald Breen Herron.

James Myron McMillin.
Robert Hugh Kreuter.
Laurence Wood Bartlett.
Donald Frank Stace.
Reynolds Johnston Burt, jr.
John Dickerson Mitchell.
Clarence Henry Schabacker.
Ewart Jackson Strickland.
Robert Snyder Trimble, jr.
John Francis Cassidy.
John Foxhall Sturman, jr.
George Leo Doolittle.
Hugh Whitaker Winslow.
Russell Vance Eastman.
Francis Henry Lanahan, jr.
Courtney Parker Young.
John Donald Robertson.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

To be lieutenant colonel.

William C. Webb.

To be majors.

Francis Thompson Colby.
Albert Robert Gardner.
Edward Cornelius Hanford.
William Henry Kennedy.
Chester Benjamin McCormick.
Gordon Handy McCoy.
Harleigh Parkhurst.
Milton Hager Taulbee.
Harold Gerard Fitz.
Robert Menees Milam.
William McCleave.

To be captains.

Stanley Staunton Addis.
Philo Allcott, jr.
Harry Bernard Allen.
William Floyd Armstrong.
Cyril Bassich.
William Pinckney Bledsoe.
Hugh Boone.
Lemuel Evans Boren.
Horace Herbert Braun.
Howard Clay Brenizer.
Alpha Brumage.
Frank W. Bryant.
Douglas Gerald Burrill.
Rumsey Campbell.
William Archibald Campbell.
Frank Gilson Chaddock.
John Carl Cook.
John Gerak Cook.
Malcolm Robert Cox.
James Geiger Coxetter.
Melville Stratton Creusere.
George Louis Danforth.
Mark Albert Dawson.
James Madison De Weese.
Zenas Newton Estes.
Edward Fehlig.
Arthur Cole Fitzhugh.
Joseph Knox Fornance.
Jesse James France.
George Abram Gore.
Frederick Theodore Gundry.
Hamp Hansford Hanks.
Samuel Charles Harrison.
Thomas Castleman Harry.
William Dalton Hays.
Lewis Blaine Hershey.
Albert Edward Higgins.
Walter Hitzfeldt.
William Leonard Hogg.
Chalmers Duke Horne.
James Clark Hughes.
Stewart Jackson.
John C. Johnston.
Daniel Floyd Jones.
Thomas Willis Jones.
John David Key.
Harry W. O. Kinnard.
William Emmett Kneass.
Charles Carroll Knight, jr.
August Arvid Krantz.
Benjamin Bussey Lattimore.

James Campbell Lewis, jr.
 William Brooks McCollum.
 Schaumburg McGehee.
 Stuart McLeod.
 Edward Joseph Maloy.
 Jewett DeWitt Matthews.
 John H. Milam.
 Armand Sherman Miller.
 Ray Calhoun Montgomery.
 Clarence Flagg Murray.
 Marshall Joseph Noyes.
 Clyde Deans Parmelee.
 Leo L. Partlow.
 Allen Hemingway Platt.
 Audley Maxwell Post.
 Harry Lawrence Powell, jr.
 Howard Mansfield Randall.
 Alston Pringle Rhett.
 Stanley Richardson.
 Peter Powell Rodes.
 Stanley William Root.
 Sumner Morris Smith.
 Richard James Sothern.
 Bernard Sweet.
 Helmer Swenholz.
 Charles Marion Thirkeld.
 Irvin B. Warner.
 William Kean Weaver.
 John Daniel White.
 Charles Anderson Wickliffe.
 Everett Charles Williams.
 B. Conn Anderson.
 John Henry Ball.
 Edward T. Eneboe.
 John Miller Fray.
 Charles Robert Hall.
 Edward Foster Hart.
 James Leslie McIlhenny.
 John Nash.
 Sumner Henry Needham.
 Victor Leander Oleson.
 Andrew Raymond Reeves.
 Channing Rust Toy.
 Preston Thompson Vance.
 William B. Weston.
 Arthur Lee Dasher.

To be first lieutenants.

Robert Lee Allen, jr.
 Philip Whalley Allison.
 Edgar Theodore Anderson.
 Edwin Yancey Argo.
 Leonard Sherod Arnold.
 John Jeremiah Bachman.
 Jesmond Dene Balmer.
 Russell Gilbert Barkalow.
 John Dean Barrigan.
 Paul Gervais Bell.
 Ralph Cobb Benner.
 Chauncey Aubrey Bennett.
 Elmer Royal Block.
 Lester Levi Boggs.
 Harwood Christian Bowman.
 John Glenn Brackinridge.
 Clinton Bowen Fisk Brill.
 Willis Stanley Bryant.
 Tunstall Bryars.
 Stephen Eugene Bullock.
 Martin Owen Cahill.
 Milo Clair Calhoun.
 George Morgan Cheney.
 Harold Thomas Chittum.
 William James Clark.
 Albert Joshua Clayton.
 Noble Milton Coe.
 John Henry Corridon.
 Alfred Cooley Croft, jr.
 Robert Henry Crosby.
 George H. Cushman, jr.
 Roy Lawrence Dalferes.
 William Eldon Doeller.
 Albert Crofut Donovan.
 George Head Duff.
 Robert William Ehinger.
 Eric Alexander Erickson.
 William Settle Evans.

Daniel Bern Floyd.
 Hugh Joseph Gaffey.
 Arthur Vincent Gair.
 Albert Charles Gale.
 Frederick Harold Gaston.
 Clough Farrar Gee.
 Royal Leonard Gervais.
 Frank Gosnell, jr.
 Harold Jackson Guernsey.
 Erskine Burt Halley.
 John Monroe Hamilton.
 Henry Christopher Harrison, jr.
 Warren Hayford, 3d.
 Loyal Moyer Haynes.
 Hugh Bryan Hester.
 Doyle Overton Hickey.
 Allen Bonham Hicklin.
 Jonathan Hunt.
 Richard Grant Hunter.
 Shirley Randolph Hurt.
 Earl Alva Hyde.
 Edward Foster James.
 Walter Edward Jenkins.
 Keith Kenneth Jones.
 Frank Elwin Kauffman.
 Thomas Ralph Kerschner.
 Arthur Edwin King.
 Walter Leui Kluss.
 Robert Henry Knapp.
 Richard Adams Knight.
 Emil Frederick Kollmer.
 Lewis Frederick Kosch.
 Arthur Hurd Lee.
 Charles Benjamin Leinbach.
 William Branch Leitch.
 Benjamin Haw Lowry.
 John McDowell.
 Osgood Cook McIntyre.
 Pierre Mallett.
 Richard Carvel Mallonee.
 Robert Grant Mangum.
 Owen Meredith Marshburn.
 Marcus Henry Meeks, jr.
 William Michener.
 Thomas North.
 Irving Devance Offer.
 James Carlisle Patterson.
 Earl Martin Peckinpough.
 William Addison Ray.
 Harold Charles Raymond.
 Lewis Evans Reigner.
 Frank George Rogers.
 Otto Runde, jr.
 Chester Eugene Sargent.
 Oscar Nelson Schjerven.
 Maylon Edward Scott.
 Hamilton Folts Searight.
 Albert Chester Searle.
 Henry Mackay Shaw.
 Joseph Aloysius Shea.
 Fred Ampere Smith.
 John Andrew Smith, jr.
 Paul Clarence Spears.
 Ralph David Sproull.
 Moore Alexander Stuart.
 George Harrison Stuts.
 Joseph Albert Sullivan.
 John Joseph Turner.
 Josiah Ara Wallace.
 Overton Walsh.
 Paul Henry Weiland.
 Richard Boccock Willis.
 Arthur Riehl Wilson.
 Thomas Reed Willson.
 Peyton Winlock.
 Horace McParlin Woodward, jr.
 Marion Lyman Young.
 Richard Hamlin Bacon.
 William Arthur Beiderlinden.
 Bennie Caruth Hampton.
 Boyce Manly James.
 Charles Roderick Mize.
 Maurice Vernon Patton.
 Edward James Roxbury.
 Henry Edward Tisdale.
 Grant Heninger.

To be second lieutenants.

Polk Johnson Atkinson.
 Herbert Edward Baker.
 Herschel David Baker.
 Albert Pierpont Barnes.
 Leland Hudson Barnes.
 Harry Wesley Bauer.
 John William Beck.
 Guy Clifton Benson.
 Clinton Steele Berrien.
 Herbert Linus Berry.
 Julius Trousdale Berry.
 James Patrick Boland.
 Henry Beaumont Pennell Boody.
 Albert Brill.
 David Dick Caldwell.
 Charles Deans Calley.
 Franklin Harwood Canlett.
 Charles Rudolph Carlson.
 Lawrence Haley Caruthers.
 Phil Cass.
 Hugh Cort.
 Frederick Eugene Coyne, jr.
 Hyman Jackson Crigger.
 Ulmont Ogden Cumming.
 William James Daw.
 Charles Herbert Day.
 Tonnes Dennison.
 Joseph Cuthbert Dolan.
 Joseph Phillip Donnovin.
 Norman Joseph Eckert.
 Ralph Andrew Eiler.
 William A. Enos.
 Frederic Cooley Eveleth.
 Burdette Mase Fitch.
 Henry Chambers Floyd.
 Thomas Oscar Foreman.
 William Russell Frost.
 Nicolas Fosdick Galbraith.
 Michael Vincent Gannon.
 Lloyd Russell Garrison.
 John Carson Grable.
 John Gross.
 Thomas Standifer Gunby.
 Clyde Milton Hallam.
 Albert James Hastings.
 Charles Walter Hensey.
 Lawrence Eugene Heyduck.
 Raymond Thomas Joseph Higgins.
 Carl Gilbert Holmes.
 William Clarkson Huggins.
 William Herman Jaeger.
 Newton Wesley Jones.
 Paul Ruthven Jones.
 Wesley Karlson.
 Thomas Francis Keefe.
 Henry Leonard Kersh.
 Isaac Leonard Kitts.
 Joseph Horace Landrum.
 James Yancey Le Gette.
 John Max Lentz.
 Hanford Nichols Lockwood, jr.
 John Boardman Lord.
 Charles Kellogg McAlister.
 William Clinton McCarthy.
 Otto Lucratus McDaniel.
 James Houston McWilliams.
 Owen Russell Marriott.
 Paul Matson.
 Charles William Mays.
 Edward Harold Metzger.
 Arden Clucas Miller.
 Robert Owen Montgomery.
 James Ferris Morison.
 Emmett Augustus Nibiack.
 Crowell Edward Pease.
 Marion Milton Pharr.
 Oliver Felton Porter.
 Russell Dean Powell.
 Philip Theodore Quinn.
 Hobart Dewey Reed.
 Paul Allen Reichle.
 Alexander Sinclair Reynolds.
 Elmer Clifford Ringer.
 Donald Boyer Rogers.

William Robert Schaefer.
 John Lee Shea.
 Patrick Eugene Shea.
 Arthur Lee Shreve.
 Richard Hawley Slider.
 Henry Elmer Sowell.
 Stephen Edward Stancisko.
 Robert Taylor Strode.
 Clarence Richard Sutherland.
 Edward Milan Taylor.
 Harvey John Thornton.
 Francis Harold Vanderwerker.
 Severn Teackle Wallis, jr.
 Harry Lee Watts, jr.
 William Norris White.
 John Hastings Winston.
 Richard Royall Baker, jr.
 James Emerson Bush.
 Lloyd H. Duffin.
 Otto Ellis.
 Ernest Anthony Elwood.
 Lonnie Ottis Field.
 Seward Lincoln Mains, jr.
 Raymond George Miller.
 John Major Reynolds.
 Michael Condon Shea.
 Norris Peters Walsh.
 Edward Albert Routhau.
 Theodore Temple Knappen.
 Godfrey Douglas Adamson.
 Albert Newell Tanner, jr.
 William Alter Watson.
 Harold Frank Handy.
 Richard Clare Partridge.
 Edward John McGaw.
 John Charles Felli.
 Tyree Rivers Horn.
 James Woodrow Clark.
 Joseph Leo Langevin.
 Willard Pierce Lerner.
 William Hardy Hill.
 Louis Jacob Claterbos.
 Herbert Ralph Pierce.
 Carl Victor Erickson.
 Auguste Rhu Taylor.
 Frank Andrew Henning.
 James Malcolm Lewis.
 Donald Eddy Cummings.
 Bernard Linn Robinson.
 John Robert Culleton.
 Charles Steinhart Whitmore.
 James Hobson Stratton.
 Edward Haviland Lastayo.
 George DeGraaf.
 James Alexander Samouce.
 William Wallace Ford.
 George Dewey Vanture.
 Charles Barney Harding.
 Harry Earl Fisher.
 Donald Sylvester Burns.
 Donald James Leehey.
 Carl Edwin Berg.
 William Squires Wood, jr.
 Thomas Arnett Roberts, jr.
 Francis Henry Morse.
 Edward Macon Edmonson.
 Ben Miller Campbell.
 Leslie Burgess Downing.
 William Ignatius Brady.
 Eugene Martin Link.
 John Simpson Hastings.
 Cornelius Garrison.
 William Harry Bartlett.
 Edward Clinton Gillette, jr.
 Russell Owen Smith.
 Freeman Grant Cross.
 Rex Van Den Corput, jr.
 Homer Watson Klefer.
 Joseph Harris.
 John George Howard.
 Ford Trimble.

CAVALRY.

To be majors.

Warren Adger Fair.
 Karl Edward Linderfelt.

Lute P. Stover.
Edward Bowditch, jr.
John Grant MacDonnell.
Paul Root Davison.

To be captains.

Daniel Becker.
Henry Duplessis Beylard.
Jacob Albert Blankenship.
Roy Eugene Blount.
Walter Buford.
Sam Day Carter.
Ira Augustus Correll.
Frank Jaynes Cory.
Charles Hal Dayhuff.
Clyde Delaware Garrison.
Samuel Rivington Goodwin.
Samuel Alexander Greenwell.
William Arthur Haverfield.
Herbert Lee Jackson.
Harry Christian Kaefring.
John Nelson Merrill.
Clarence Humbert Murphy.
Harry Augustus Patterson.
Theodore Maurice Roemer.
Clifford William Sands.
William Francis Saportas.
John Fulton Reynolds Scott.
Sherman I. Strong.
Thomas Dorrington Wadlington, jr.
James Henry Washburn.
Royden Williamson.
Roy Cornelius Woodruff.
Charles Summers Miller.
James Carlyle Ward.

To be first lieutenants.

Henry Tureman Allen, jr.
Frank Watt Arnold.
Clyde Eugene Austin.
Svening Johannes Bang.
Ellis Bashore.
Harrison Sheldon Beecher.
Harry Winchester Benson.
Sexton Berg.
Paul Cassius Berlin.
Howard Alton Boone.
Harry Le Roy Branson.
Frank Ellsworth Brokaw.
Thomas Almeron Bryant.
Claude Onias Burch.
Charles Winston Burkett.
John Bryce Casseday.
Harvey Newton Christman.
David Esmond Cleary.
Fayette Fargo Collins.
George David Condren.
Robert Lee Cox.
Charles Cramer.
Louis Russell Crawford.
Daniel Bernard Cullinane.
George Prentice Cummings.
Willis Robert Dallas.
Edward Harleston DeSaussure.
Frank Osborn Dewey.
Ernest Franklin Dukes.
Fred Fabri.
Herbert Edwin Featherstone.
William Taliaferro Fletcher.
Lawrence Gibson Forsythe.
Richard Mozier Gaw.
Royce Pannebecker Gerfen.
John Newport Greene.
Frank Merritt Harshberger.
Stanton Higgins.
Walter Averill Hill.
Rhey Thoburn Holt.
Winfred Houghton.
Merritt Hyndman.
William Kenahan.
James Alphonse Killian.
Harry Knight.
Charles Washington Latimer.
Gill McCook.
Oscar Mitchell Massey.
Richard Kidder Meade.
James Truman Menzie.

Tom Barry Miller.
Wilford Reagan Mobley.
Frederick Thomas Murphy.
Shelby Cyrus Newman.
George Aloysius O'Donnell.
Cornelius Francis O'Keefe.
James Bernard Patterson.
Orland Smith Peabody.
Thomas K. Petty.
Clyde Pickett.
Frank Edwin Powers.
Eugene Arthur Regnier.
Hurley Oran Richardson.
Gilbert Rieman.
Paul McDonald Robinett.
Walter Carey Rogers.
Leon Schneider.
George Henry Shea.
Benton Gribble Shoemaker.
Henry Mills Shoemaker.
George Irvin Smith.
James Everett Snider.
Clayton Evans Snyder.
Wallace Chace Steiger.
Perry Edward Taylor.
William Tussey.
Charles Davis Vollers.
Isaac George Walker, jr.
Roy Claire Wells.
Edward Shippen West.
Howard B. K. Willis.
Zachary Taylor Wood.
Herbert Wheeler Worcester.
Joseph Yuditsky.
Clarence Kennedy Aikin.
Charles Rawlings Chase.
Gersum Cronander.
Harold Eugene Eastwood.
William Foelsing.
John Alexander McLoughlin.
Ben Allen Mason.
Alberto Eugene Merrill.
Einar Nelson Schjerven.
John Phillip Scott.
Byron Earle Shirley.
William Yeates.
William J. McChesney, jr.

To be second lieutenants.

Engmann August Andersen.
Charles Vernon Barnum.
Jess Garnett Boykin.
James Courtney Browne.
Henry Herbert Cameron.
Leslie Dillon Carter.
Reuben Castor.
William Stilwell Conrow.
Earle Everette Cox.
Buckner Miller Creel.
Hugh Gibson Culton.
James Brian Edmunds.
Harold Engerud.
Charles W. Fake.
Andrew Edward Forsyth.
Harry Albert Fudge.
James Victor Gagne.
Benjamin Harrison Graban.
William Henry Halstead.
William Robert Hamby.
William Lincoln Hamilton.
John Hilliard Healy.
Clifford Irving Hunn.
Charles Moorman Hurt.
Marcus Ellis Jones.
Morton McDonald Jones.
Haynie McCormick.
George Roland McElroy.
Charles Homer Martin.
Gene Russell Mauger.
William Russell Mears.
Herbert Sherman Nettleton.
Anderson Hassell Norton.
Lewis Abram Pulling.
George Jackson Rawlins.
George Windle Read, jr.

Fraser Richardson.
 Clarence Walter Richmond.
 Silas Warren Robertson.
 Chauncey Whitney Sampsell.
 Thomas Francis Sheehan.
 Garrett Bruce Shomber.
 Leighton Nicol Smith.
 Roy Henry Speck.
 Curtis Loyd Stafford.
 Alphonse Stoeckle.
 Leland Fries Strader.
 George Ferdinand Stutsman, jr.
 Mortimer Francis Sullivan.
 Hubert Taylor Sutton.
 Benjamin Arthur Thomas.
 Fred Charles Thomas.
 John Redmond Thornton.
 Theodore Ernest Voigt.
 Everett Dudley Yerby.
 Malcolm Byrne.
 Elmer Douglas Campbell.
 Vaughan Morris Cannon.
 Robert Shirley Clayton.
 Preston Wilson Gillette.
 Oscar William Koch.
 Alexander Garrett Olsen.
 Sidney Cushman Page.
 Oakley Leigh Sanders.
 Bickford Edward Sawyer.
 Harry Marten Schwarze.
 Otto Rudolph Stillinger.
 Benners Brasfield Vail.
 Garnett Hamilton Wilson.
 Howard Bratton, jr.
 Willis McDonald, 3d.
 James Kenneth Mitchell.
 Lawrence Granger Smith.
 Bertram Wright Randles.
 Verne Donald Mudge.
 Joseph R. Stauffer.
 Earl Henry Blaik.
 Edgar Allan Gilbert, jr.
 Fred Lebbeus Hamilton.
 Gainer Brown Jones.
 Wilbert Engdahl Shallene.
 Clarence Clemens Clendenen.
 Eugene Collum Johnston.
 James Ludwell Lake, jr.
 James Hess Walker.
 Lyman Lincoln Judge.
 Lawrence Edward Schick.
 Henry Chester Hine, jr.
 Elias Sanford Gregory.
 William Price Withers.
 Frederick Robert Pitts.
 Arthur Kenley Hammond.
 Martin Charles Casey.
 William Wallace McMillan.
 Kenneth Gilpin Hoge.
 James Frederick Wahl.
 Robert Edwards.
 Lawrence Joseph Carr.
 Robert Dickerson Durst.
 Clovis Ethelbert Byers.
 George Andrew Rehm.
 Edward Carl Engelhart.

INFANTRY.

To be colonel.

Hubert Allison Allen.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Edmund Clarence Abbott.

Arthur William Bradbury.

To be majors.

James William Franklin Allen.
 Oliver Allen.
 George Blair.
 Alfred Wainwright Bloor.
 Frank Earl Bonney.
 Henry August Bootz.
 Sidney Glenn Brown.
 Bowyer Brockenbrough Browne.
 John Doyle Carmody.
 Alvin Colburn.
 Robert Boyd Cole.

Harry Coope.
 William Leon Culberson.
 Joseph Hamilton Davidson.
 George Clinton Donaldson.
 Charles William Dyer.
 John Donaldson Easton.
 Allen Fletcher.
 John William Foos.
 Godfrey Rees Fowler.
 Robert John Halpin.
 Raymond Waite Hardenbergh.
 Arthur Brainard Hitchcock.
 Josiah Kemp.
 Thomas Willmot King.
 Joseph Joachim Koch.
 Fred Lee Lemmon.
 Fred Warde Llewellyn.
 Elbert Johnston Lyman.
 Dupont Bayard Lyon.
 Sam Inman McCants.
 Charles Emmet McCarthy.
 Wallach Arthur McCathran.
 Arthur Lee McCoy.
 Arthur Hamilton MacKie.
 Francis Marion Maddox.
 Michael Joseph O'Brien.
 Laurence Stephen O'Toole.
 Joseph Benjamin Pate.
 Louis Pearl Patten.
 Roy Livingston Platt.
 Woodell Abner Pickering.
 Edward Ormonde Power.
 Wood Lee Ray.
 Laurence Wilfred Redington.
 Frank Cornelius Reilly.
 Thornton Rogers.
 Carl Herndon Seals.
 Rafael Angel Segarra.
 William Henry Shutan.
 William Alexander Smith.
 William Andrew Stack.
 Charles Albert Stokes.
 Lee Sumner.
 Charles Wilbur Thomas, jr.
 Lee Stephen Tillotson.
 Arthur Charles Tipton.
 Walter Preston Tyler.
 Millard Fillmore Waltz.
 Shields Warren.
 James Arthur Watson.
 Harold Julian Weeks.
 Merrill Dole Wheeler.
 William Clinton Williams.
 Robert Kerr Alcott.
 Charles Stephen Buck.
 Harry Fouts Hazlett.
 William Albert Jones.
 Bertram Llewellyn Cadwalader.
 Sheppard Blunden Philpot.
 Tom Kennan Price Stilwell.
 Henry Williams Stiness.
 Laurence Woodville Young.

To be captains.

Ward M. Ackley.
 Frederick William Adams.
 Joseph Clark Addington.
 Dana Henry Allen.
 Earl Almon.
 Curtis DeWitt Alway.
 Forrest Edward Ambrose.
 Lewis W. Amis.
 Kenneth Smith Anderson.
 Howard Weldon Angus.
 Elmer John Armstrong.
 Charles Otis Ashton.
 Stanley George Backman.
 Henry Dickson Bagnall.
 Floyd Herbert Bain.
 Russell Baker.
 Aubrey Haines Baldwin.
 James Horace Barbin.
 Thomas Waples Barnard.
 Robert Sherley Batman.
 Theodore Anton Baumeister.
 John Henry Baxter.

Thomas Caffin Beck.
 Frank Frederick Becker.
 Price Walter Beebe.
 William Richard Bent.
 Edward Chambers Betts.
 Maurice Clenen Bigelow.
 Haskell Clark Billings.
 Clifford E. Black.
 Stanley Gifford Blanton.
 Thomas Edwin Blood.
 Charles Carroll Bodeker.
 Eli Whitney Bonney.
 James Arthur Boyers.
 Alfred Goodrich Braden, jr.
 Don Pedro Branson.
 William Thomas Brock.
 Horace Joseph Brooks.
 Thomas Cole Brown.
 Myron Gilbert Browne.
 Joseph Henry Burgheim.
 Harry Nelson Burkhalter.
 Gilbert Burnett.
 John Halpin Burnes.
 William Giroud Burt.
 Rufus Alexander Byers.
 Michael James Byrne.
 Howard Farlowe Kent Cahill.
 Nathaniel Ernest Callen.
 Stuart Duncan Campbell.
 Lee W. Card.
 Charles Dayton Carle.
 William Moore Carter.
 Paul Hanford Cartter.
 James Casey.
 Bosier Castle.
 Albert Gardner Chase.
 Thornton Chase.
 John Robin Davis Cleland.
 Franklin Miller Cochran.
 John Constantine Cody.
 Frank Packard Coffin.
 Daniel Warwick Colboun.
 Jose Enrique Colom.
 Emmett Richard Colpin.
 Joseph Hooker Comstock.
 Walter Conner.
 Joseph Leo Connolly.
 Paul Daniel Connor.
 Gwynne Conrad.
 Raymond Parker Cook.
 Elliot Duncan Cooke.
 Edgar Garfield Cooper.
 Jesse DeWitt Cope.
 George Aloysius Corbin.
 Charles Sidney Coulter.
 Robert Grant Cousley.
 Horatio Grant Coykendall.
 John Walter Crissy.
 James Cave Crockett.
 John Hudspeth Crozier.
 William Alexander Cunningham.
 James Washington Curtis.
 Murray Taylor Davenport.
 Earl Hamlin DeFord.
 Vernon Calhoun DeVotie.
 William White Dick.
 John Robert Dinsmore.
 Wiley Lee Dixon.
 Irvin Edward Doane.
 Patrick Joseph Dodd.
 Philip Doddridge, jr.
 Frederick Sidney Doll.
 James Sidney Douglas, jr.
 Harley Albert Dresback.
 William Harvey Dukes.
 Edward Eccles.
 John Rice Eden.
 Henry William Edmonds.
 Paul Sutphin Edwards.
 Gerald Egan.
 Grover B. Egger.
 Harold H. Elarth.
 John William Elkins, jr.
 Arnold Wright Ellis.
 Dan Maynard Ellis.

John Harris Elson.
 Ernest Ward Ely.
 Reyburn Engles.
 Charles Thompson Estes.
 Davis Hudson Estill.
 Clarence Charles Fenn.
 Daniel Wallace Finlayson.
 Corvan Fisher.
 William Fisk.
 Rufo Mc-Amis Fitzpatrick.
 Arthur Floyd.
 Morris Handley Forbes.
 Leslie Rudisill Forney.
 John Russel Fountain.
 Daniel Gould Fowle.
 Wilbur Joseph Fox.
 Rene Eugene Fraile.
 John Robert Francis.
 Paul Oscar Franson.
 Joseph Jerome Fraser.
 Ottmann William Freeborn.
 Jesse Knox Freeman.
 Alfred George French.
 Carroll Morton Gale.
 Harold Howard Galliett.
 Enrique Garcia.
 Herbert William Garrison.
 Claude Elmer Gaskins.
 Frederick Louis Gerlach.
 James Riley Ludlow Gibbons.
 Roy Samuel Gibson.
 Thomas Robert Gibson.
 Julian Hurlburt Gist.
 Robert Fulton Glen.
 Clifford A. Gray.
 Eldridge Arnold Green.
 Thomas Edward Guy.
 Harry Martel Gwynn.
 Roy Franklin Hall.
 William Hays Hammond.
 Purl LeRoy Harms.
 Herbert Langley Harries.
 Lester Joslyn Harris.
 Thomas Asbury Harris.
 Guy Lafayette Hartman.
 John James Harvey.
 Irving Harvey.
 Chester Price Haycock.
 Albert Mearl Head.
 George Roscoe Hedge.
 Albert Brengle Helsley.
 Stephen Garrett Henry.
 Thomas Henry.
 Edmund Nelson Hébert.
 Charles Elmer Hetrick.
 Ernest Alexander Higgins.
 Pearl Delbert Hill.
 George Wheeler Hinman, jr.
 John Marshall Hite.
 Paul Thomas Hogge.
 Nelson Miles Holderman.
 Felix Robert Holmes.
 John Hopkins.
 Edward John Houck.
 Constantine Buckley Howard.
 Samuel Francis Howard.
 Otho Wilder Humphries.
 Ira Augustus Hunt.
 Burr Polk Irwin.
 Edward Charles Jackson.
 George Edward Jacobs.
 George Augustus Jahant.
 Robert Joerg.
 Ernest Thomas Jones.
 Frank Alfred Jones.
 Morgan Ellis Jones.
 Oscar Kain.
 Charles Herbert Karlstad.
 Elmer Kemp.
 Henry Thomas Kent.
 William Hardy Kent.
 Charles Edwin Knickerbocker.
 Andrew Thomas Knight.
 Butler Lewis Knight.
 Frank Bishop Lammons.

Louis James Lampke.
 Walter Gilbert Layman.
 Bert Marshall Lennon.
 Charles Lewis.
 Herbert Horton Lewis.
 William Evan Lewis.
 Frederick Albertis Lind.
 Elmer G. Lindroth.
 Frank Elijah Linnell.
 John Webster Llufrío.
 Frank Lockhead.
 Paul Parker Logan.
 George Anderson Longstreth.
 Ralph Brundidge Lovett.
 Charles Elliott Lucas.
 William Karr Lyda.
 John Lynch.
 William Arthur McAdam.
 John McBride.
 Grattan Herbert McCafferty.
 John Wade McCormick.
 Alexander McGee.
 Arthur Pierson McGee.
 Earl Garfield McMillen.
 Douglass Newman McMillin.
 Charles Henry McNair.
 Donald Marion McRae.
 Earle Howard Malone.
 Walter Mulford Mann.
 Homer William Mason.
 Cylburn Otto Mattfeldt.
 Herbert Bryans May.
 Evan Kirkpatrick Meredith.
 James Metcalf.
 Raymond Oscar Miller.
 Robert Scott Miller.
 William Anderson Patteson Moncure.
 Jeffery Gerald Archevale Montague.
 Francis Joseph Montgomery.
 Alexander Leggett Morris.
 William Pitt Morse.
 Charley Muller.
 William George Muller.
 John Joseph Murphy.
 William Aloysius Murphy.
 Selim Woodworth Myers.
 John Henry Nankivell.
 Robert Herman Neely.
 Carroll Harper Newell.
 George Byron Norris.
 Irving Alvan Oppermann.
 Ade Orrill.
 Herman Edward Osann.
 Cuthbert Alexander Osborn.
 Ingomar Marcus Oseth.
 David Austin Palmer.
 Andrew Jackson Patterson.
 Milton Humes Patton.
 Orsen Everett Paxton.
 Samuel Clinton Payne.
 Hawthorne Perkins.
 Arthur James Perry.
 Harry Pforzheimer.
 Hugh Morehead Pinkerton.
 Willis Arthur Platts.
 Robert Osborne Poage.
 Frank Glenn Potts.
 Andrew Jackson Powell.
 Charles Clement Quigley.
 Perry Cole Ragan.
 George Howard Rarey.
 Frederick William Rase.
 Senius John Raymond.
 Harry Harrison Reeves.
 Edward Joseph Rehmann.
 George Thomas Rice.
 Malcolm Rice.
 Neal Willard Richmond.
 Grover Cleveland Rippetoe.
 Edgar Evans Robinson.
 Edwin Severett Ross.
 Archie Keefer Rupert.
 Clinton Rush.
 Robert Grier St. James.
 Howard Noah Scales.
 Edward Reynolds Schauffler.

Joseph John Schmidt.
 Theodore Schoge.
 William Phil Schwatel.
 Frederick Samuel Scobie.
 Walter Earl Seamon.
 Charles Waldemar Seifert.
 Frank Edwin Sharpless.
 Frank Eugene Shaw.
 John Albert Shaw.
 Thomas Joseph Sheehy.
 Arthur Musser Sheets.
 Tryon Mason Shepherd.
 Clyde Moore Shropshire.
 William Arthur Sirmon.
 Guy Warren Skinner.
 John Charles Skuse.
 Theodore James Sledge.
 Frank Martin Smith.
 George Harry Smith.
 LeRoy Foster Smith.
 Ridgway Pancoast Smith.
 Gottfried Wells Sperry.
 Roscoe Arthur Dean Stanis.
 Alexander Newton Stark, jr.
 Arthur Jack Stark.
 Oscar Glenn Stevens.
 William McPhail Stewart.
 Harry Melville Stinson.
 Paul Dupont Strong.
 Owen Summers.
 Robert Emory Swab.
 Allender Swift.
 Robert Lester Tavenner.
 Herbert Francis Teate.
 Joseph Vincent Theband.
 Thomas Thomas.
 Jesse Lee Thompson.
 John Ernest Tiedeman.
 Stephen Ralph Tiffany.
 Eugene Herbert Tilton.
 Austin Triplett.
 Donald Hatfield Tripp.
 Albert Leon Tuttle.
 Jacob Edward Uhrig.
 Edwin Meredith VanVoorhees.
 William Waite.
 Sherman Potter Walker.
 William George Walker.
 Fred Walters.
 Charles Manly Walton.
 Harry Griffith Weaver.
 Lamar Weaver.
 Oscar Thomas Webster.
 Richard Morgan Webster.
 Earl Wettengel.
 James Wheelin.
 Arthur Randolph Whitner.
 Fred Ordway Wickham.
 Robert Wigglesworth.
 Roland Wilkins.
 Carmi Luzerne Williams.
 William Henry Williams.
 Fred Charles Winters.
 William Vincent Witcher, jr.
 Louis Arthur Witney.
 Charles Oliver Wolfe.
 Robert Lee Wright.
 William Huffman Young.
 Kenneth George Althaus.
 Henry August Andres.
 Harry Donnell Ayres.
 James Coleman Barnes.
 Eugene Edmund Barton.
 Arthur Freeman Bowen.
 George Caldwell.
 John Walter Campbell.
 Fred Chase Christy.
 William Isaac Cole.
 Guy Griswold Cowen.
 George Irving Cross.
 Odber Merrill Cutler.
 William Francis Dalton.
 Charles William Dickson.
 Thomas William Doyle.
 Roy Henri Evans.

Walter Gregory.
 Thomas Edwin Griffith.
 Earl Newell Hackney.
 Judson Hannigan.
 William Franklin Harrison.
 Theodore Porter Heap.
 Charles Sverre Hendricksen.
 William Holmes.
 Jack Wesley Howard.
 James William Howder.
 William Judkins.
 George Ernest Kelsch.
 Paul Rutherford Knight.
 Howard John Liston.
 James Paul Lloyd.
 Frederic Kenneth Long.
 John Hume Lucas.
 Clyde Arthur Lundy.
 William Eugene McClelland.
 Lorenzo Dow Macy.
 Charles Lawrence Marsh.
 Thomas Everett May.
 George Arthur Monagon.
 George Munteanu.
 William Rasor Richey, jr.
 Benjamin Jackson Sells.
 Marion Fred Shepherd.
 Charles Frederick Silvester.
 Leland Warren Skaggs.
 Thomas Scott Smith.
 Newton Withington Speece.
 James Sproule.
 Charles Samuel Tator.
 William Anthony Woodlief.
 Grosvenor Liebenau Wotkins.

To be first lieutenants.

Martin Ackerson.
 Zane Irwin Adair.
 Harry Kuteman Adams.
 John Edward Adamson.
 Ernest Clifton Adkins.
 Russell Conwell Akins.
 Dallas Royce Alfonte.
 Virgil Grover Allen.
 Clinton James Ancker.
 James Norwood Ancrum.
 Carl Christian Andersen.
 Albert Eugene Andrews.
 Waine Archer.
 John Graham Ardon.
 Edward Avery Austin.
 Harry Allen Austin.
 Joseph Louis Bachus.
 Arthur Richardson Baird.
 Paul Gerhardt Balcar.
 Perry Lee Baldwin.
 Ross Ormali Baldwin.
 Walter Albert Ball.
 Harold Harrison Barbur.
 Ernest Stratton Barker.
 Allison Joseph Barnett.
 David Eugene Barnett.
 David Goodwin Barr.
 Aubrey Jefferson Bassett.
 George Samuel Beatty.
 William Henry Beers.
 Eugene Vincent Behan.
 Leigh Bell.
 Leo Alexander Bessette.
 John Jacob Bethurum.
 Walter Asbury Bigby.
 David Almedus Bissett.
 Ira Woodruff Black.
 William Jasper Black.
 Arthur Clay Blain.
 James Palmer Blakeney.
 George Fridjhof Bloomquist.
 George Lucius Blossom.
 John Wilmar Blue.
 Lucian Dalton Bogan.
 Harry Watson Bolan.
 Eason Jackson Bond.
 Henry Winter Borntraeger.
 Ernest Francis Boruski.
 Marcus Butler Boulware.

Jesse Russell Bowles.
 Logan Woods Boyd.
 Ernest Everett Boyle.
 Clifford Henry Boyles.
 Sam Miller Brabson.
 Grover Cleveland Brandt.
 William Wallace Brier, jr.
 Eugene Lawrence Brine.
 Francis Gerard Brink.
 John Farmer Brinson.
 Frank Roy Brockschink.
 Edgar Kehlor Brockway.
 Merl Louis Broderick.
 Wilbur Fisk Browder.
 Brisbane Hanks Brown.
 Cole Brown.
 Edmond Hugh Brown.
 Leslie Walter Brown.
 William Leslie Brown.
 Curran Browne.
 Raymond William Bryant.
 Otho Williams Budd, jr.
 Edward William Budy.
 Theodore Bundy.
 Loyd Daniel Bunting.
 Samuel S. Burgey.
 Arthur Edwin Burnap.
 Donald Charles Burnett.
 Robert Matthews Burr.
 Braxton De Creves Butler.
 Fred Stevens Byerly.
 Edwin McCune Byles.
 William Henry Shaw Callahan.
 Carey Ephriam Campbell, jr.
 George Bagby Campbell.
 James Kirker Campbell.
 Thomas Ernest Campbell.
 John Kenneth Cannon.
 Thomas Grover Carlin.
 Lee Gunnels Carson.
 Paul Dillard Carter.
 Leslie Johnathan Cartwright.
 Harvey Irvin Cassidy.
 Fred Warren Caswell.
 Arthur S. Champeny.
 Clifford Pennington Chapman.
 Elbridge Gerry Chapman, jr.
 Ben-hur Chastaine.
 Charles Wilkes Christenberry.
 John Huston Church.
 Joseph Church.
 John Sutherland Claussen.
 Walter Carl Claussen.
 Grover Cleveland Cleaver.
 John Hamilton Cochran.
 Elbridge Colby.
 Thomas Francis Coleman.
 William Harold Collette.
 Forrest Edwin Collins.
 Irving Compton.
 Leslie Norman Conger.
 Thomas Tilson.
 William Lawrence Conway.
 Charles Francis Frost Cooper.
 James Gordon Cooper, jr.
 George Mortimer Couper.
 Moses Foss Cowley.
 Malcolm Everett Craig.
 Derby Crandall, jr.
 Caspar Ray Crim.
 Sterling Manley Crim.
 Thomas Joseph Cross.
 A. Y. Culton.
 Edgar Augustine Cecil Curran.
 Edward Joseph Curren, jr.
 Millard Stowe Curtis.
 Jonas Earl Custer.
 James William Darr.
 Richard Harrington Darrell.
 George Franklin Davis.
 Howard Herndon Davis.
 Thomas Deweese Davis.
 Julian Dayton.
 Samuel Rixey Deanes.
 Henry Pierson Decker.

Morris Barnett DePass, jr.
 John Randolph DeVall.
 Irwin Samuel Dierking.
 Macey Lillard Dill.
 Fred Martin Distelhorst.
 Homer Price Dittmore.
 Hubbard Errette Dooley.
 James Edward Dooley.
 John Edward Doyle.
 Flag Allen Drewry.
 R. T. Walker Duke.
 Thomas Arthur Dukes.
 Samuel Lynn Dunlop.
 Henry DuPree.
 Marvin Bruce Durette.
 Andrew Reid Duvall.
 Fritz M. Dyer.
 Edward Palmer Earle.
 Jean Edens.
 Alfred Volekman Ednie.
 Francis Egan.
 Louis William Eggers.
 Vivion Eliot.
 Stephen Bowen Elkins.
 William Alexander Ellis.
 Fred Harry Enckhausen.
 Charles Ennis.
 Alfred Gustav Eritzland.
 Horatio Gano Fairbanks.
 Richard Fayette Fairchild.
 Castle Hobart Farish.
 John Leverett Farley.
 Clarence Redmond Farmer.
 Harry Jefferson Farner.
 Henry Hapgood Fay.
 Clinton Enos Fenters.
 Sydney Clyde Ferguson.
 Lawrence John Ferguson.
 Floyd William Ferree.
 Edward Lewis Field.
 Basil Vernon Fields.
 Norman Doud Finley.
 Melvin Ray Finney.
 Francis Michael Flanagan.
 William Ambrose Flanagan.
 Mathias Christopher Forde.
 Taylor Worcester Foreman.
 George Jacob Forster.
 Alonzo Patrick Fox.
 Eugene Nelson Frakes.
 Philip Theodore Fry.
 Harry Dennis Furey.
 Jack Roy Gage.
 John Joseph Gahan.
 Fred E. Gaillard.
 Lloyd Henry Gibbons.
 George Jacob Giger.
 Charles Sherwood Gilbert.
 Florain Dennis Giles.
 Ernest Coolidge Goding.
 Joseph James Goffard.
 Randolph Gordon.
 John James Gorman.
 Grover Cleveland Graham.
 John Carl Green.
 Frank Upton Greer.
 Edmund Mortimer Gregorie.
 Cecil John Gridley.
 Charles Clinton Griffin.
 Harland Clayton Griswold.
 Jasper Morris Groves.
 Wallace Earle Hackett.
 Harry Lee Hagan.
 Charles William Hagen.
 Frederick Hahn.
 Chester Darlington Haisley.
 Lloyd Leslie Hamilton.
 Raymond Cecil Hamilton.
 William Thomas Hammond.
 John Francis Hanley.
 David Lyddall Hardee.
 Earle Gene Harper.
 Jerome Grigg Harris.
 Lester Abraham Harris.
 Robert Van Kleeck Harris.

James Aloysius Hasson.
 Axel Hawkenson.
 Chauncey Harold Hayden.
 William Reuben Hazelrigg.
 Willis Aubrey Hedden.
 Arnold Emerson Heeter.
 Pete Turney Heffner.
 Leslie Lancaster Heller.
 Dury Lane Helm.
 Harry McCorry Henderson.
 Harry Lynn Henkle.
 Harry Henry.
 George Frye Herbert.
 Lee Malcolm Hester.
 Edgar Baldwin Heylman.
 Walter Hibbard.
 John Francis Hill.
 Milton Abram Hill.
 Eugene Ferguson Hinton.
 Chester John Hirschfelder.
 Chase Whittier Hoadley.
 Lovic Pierce Hodnette.
 Gouverneur Hoes.
 Raymond Emanuel Hoffman.
 James Leonard Hogan.
 Thomas Hull Holcombe.
 George Cook Hollingsworth.
 John James Honan.
 Francis Hood.
 Hubert Vincent Hopkins.
 John Neely Hopkins.
 Robert Lee Hostetler.
 Ray Milton House.
 Robert George Howie.
 Lee Huber.
 Lee Varnado Hunnicutt.
 Victor Geoffrey Huskea.
 Joseph Henry Hussing.
 Claire Elwood Hutchin.
 Charles Hutchings, jr.
 Grover Elmer Hutchinson.
 Clyde Lloyd Hyssong.
 Boyd Inman.
 Henry Wyatt Isbell.
 Robert Scott Israel.
 Francis Herron Jack, jr.
 Edward Bethel Jackson.
 Thomas Jefferson Jackson.
 Walter Allen Jackson.
 Richard Clark Jacobs, jr.
 John James.
 Edgar Ambrose Jarman.
 Lawrence Carmel Jaynes.
 Thomas Morris Jervey.
 Walter Jessee.
 Franklin Johnson.
 Joseph Saunders Johnson, jr.
 Richard Woodhouse Johnson.
 Robal Alphonzo Johnson.
 Louis Verne Jones.
 Ralph Emerson Jones.
 Robert Edward Jones.
 Thomas Francis Joyce.
 Edward Albert Kaech.
 John Rudolph Kaiser, jr.
 Augustine Aloysius Kane.
 Frank Augustus Keating.
 Hubert Wiley Keith.
 Clyde Kelly.
 Henry Eaton Kelly.
 James Jarlath Kelly.
 Edgar Harland Keltner.
 Charles McKinley Kemp.
 Blaisdell Cain Kennon.
 Clifford Gordon Kershaw.
 Robert James Kirk, jr.
 Alfred Percy Kitson.
 Versalius Lafayette Knadler.
 Alfred Steere Knight.
 John Herman Knuebel.
 Herbert Blend Kraft.
 Cortland Knickman Krams.
 Philip Henry Kron.
 Bradford W. Kunz.
 William Jacob Kunzmann.

Emerick Kutschko.
 John Pinnix Lake.
 Barret DeTuberville Lambert.
 Herman Odelle Lane.
 Ray Homer Larkins.
 Robert Virgil Laughlin.
 Herbert Becker Laux.
 Clarence Dixon Lavell.
 Raymond Peter Lavin.
 Jacob Herschel Lawrence.
 Carnes Bennett Lee.
 William Carey Lee.
 Howard Webster Lehr.
 Paul Ernest Leiber.
 Brooke Wilbert Leman.
 Columbus Bierce Lenow.
 Harry Leigh Lewis.
 Henry Passant Lewis.
 James Alvin Lewis.
 Charles Clarke Loughlin.
 Clarence Earle Lovejoy.
 Chauncey McCullough Lyons.
 John Virgil Lowe.
 Harry Clayton Luck.
 Edward Page Lukert.
 Richard Francis Lussier.
 Harold James Luther.
 Charles Peter Lynch.
 Earl LeVerne Lyons.
 Edward Vanmeter Macatee.
 William John McCarthy.
 Alexander Doak McClure, jr.
 Walter Daugherty McCord.
 Frank Unsworth McCoskrie.
 Edwin Douglass McCoy.
 Frank Lee McCoy.
 John Charles MacDonald.
 Raymond MacDonald.
 James Harold McDonough.
 John Leon McElroy.
 Bernice Musgrove McFadyen.
 Jackson MacFarland.
 Joseph Edwin McGill.
 LeRoy Edmund McGraw.
 Maurice Joseph McGuire.
 Thomas Milton McLamore.
 Severne Spence MacLaughlin.
 Ernest Louis McLendon.
 Julian Meredith MacMillan.
 Watson Longan McMorris.
 Alexander Jesse MacNab.
 John Chase McNally.
 Francis Joseph McNamara.
 Phillip Martin McRae.
 Harry Martin McSwain.
 Harold Burl Marr.
 Marvin Wade Marsh.
 William Francis Marshall, jr.
 Herbert James Martinson.
 James Esmond Matthews.
 William Lackey Mays.
 Kent Clayton Mead.
 Frank Curtis Mellon.
 James Edward Mendenhall.
 Laurence Mickel.
 Claude Bayles Mickelwait.
 Fred W. Miller.
 Verne Miller.
 Irwin Walter Minger.
 Karl Minnigerode.
 Raymond Kipfer Mitchell.
 Charles William Moffett.
 George Hely Molony.
 Miguel Montesinos.
 Arthur Penick Moore.
 Charles Henry Moore, jr.
 Floyd Moore.
 Frank M. Moore.
 James Patrick Moore.
 John Swan Moore.
 Richard Earl Moore.
 Richard Bartholomew Moran.
 Charles Crisp Morgan.
 James Monroe Morris.
 John Winthrop Mott.

Dewitt Talmage Mullett.
 Dennis Patrick Murphy.
 Leonard Murphy.
 Collin Stafford Myers.
 Donald John Myers.
 Vernon Leslie Nash.
 Ralph C. G. Nemo.
 Ira Claude Nicholas.
 Arthur Ross Nichols.
 William John Niederpruem.
 Frank McCormick Nihoof.
 John Edward Nolan.
 John Peter Nolan.
 Lewis Sheppard Norman.
 James Notestein.
 Maxwell Gordon Oliver.
 Glenn C. Oppy.
 Earl Wallace Ortell.
 Hans Ottzenn.
 Floyd Lavinus Parks.
 Graeme Gordon Parks.
 Edward Perry Passallaigue.
 Richard Louis Pemberton.
 Adolphus Bernard Pence.
 Charles Wilbur Pence.
 Jesse William Penn.
 Arthur Walter Penrose.
 Arthur Charles Perrin.
 Albert Gallatin Phillips.
 Archie Ellsworth Phinney.
 George Truman Phipps.
 John George Pickard.
 Arthur Pickens.
 George SESCO Pierce.
 George Corbett Pilkington.
 Dennis Coburn Pillsbury.
 Clyde Henry Plank.
 Thomas Green Poland.
 Harold Edward Potter.
 Ralph Edmund Powell.
 Joshua Dever Powers.
 Harold Ragan Priest.
 Clifton Augustine Pritchett.
 Oliver Hazzard Prizer.
 Gilbert Proctor.
 John Frederick Quensen.
 Edwin Henderson Quigley.
 Lawrence Aloysius Quinn.
 James Everett Quivey.
 John Wilbert Ramsey.
 George Nicholl Randolph.
 George Rankin.
 Walter Cox Rathbone.
 John Edwin Ray.
 Frank Lenoir Reagan.
 Harry Earl Reed.
 James Clarence Reed.
 Harold Mark Reedall.
 Allan Frank Reif.
 Thomas Arthur Reiner.
 Woodburn Edwin Remington.
 Russel Burton Reynolds.
 Thomas Boroughs Richardson.
 Adam Richmond.
 Roy Victor Rickard.
 John Orn Rody.
 James Mahan Roamer.
 Winfield Scott Roberson.
 Herbert Randolph Roberts.
 William Harold Roberts.
 Alvin Keawiula Robinson.
 Charles Andrew Robinson.
 Roy Minor Robinson.
 Lewis Burnham Rock.
 John Wesley Rodman.
 Arthur Henry Rogers.
 Fred Blackburn Rogers.
 Pleas Blair Rogers.
 Walter Harold Root.
 Floyd Holland Rose.
 David Marshall Ney Ross.
 Frank Seymoure Ross.
 Tobin Cornelius Rote.
 Douglas Horace Rubinstein.
 Carl Austin Russell.

Joseph Howard Rustemeyer.
 Ira Edgar Ryder.
 Henry Rene St. Cyr.
 Ernest Samusson.
 Robert Clyde Sanders.
 Erle Oden Sandlin.
 Charles Richard Sargent.
 Myles Douglas Savelle.
 Harry Daniels Scheibla.
 Rudolph Karl Schlaepfer.
 Richard Turner Schlosberg.
 Herbert William Schmid.
 John Samuel Schwab.
 Karl Christian Schwinn.
 Harland Fisher Seeley.
 Harry Coleman Sessions.
 Charles Stricklen Shadle.
 George Thomas Shank.
 Torrence Theodore Shannon.
 Harvey Shelton.
 Whitfield Putnam Shepard.
 Rolland Frank Sherfy.
 Robert Oliver Shoe.
 Winfield Orval Shrum.
 Arnold Miller Siler.
 Harry Richardson Simmons.
 David B. Simpson.
 Jules Verne Sims.
 Leonard Henderson Sims.
 John Benning Sinclair.
 Eugene Nelson Slappey.
 DeWitt Clinton Smith, jr.
 Eugene Ferry Smith.
 Fay Smith.
 Harvey Henry Smith.
 Walter Bedell Smith.
 Walter Emery Smith.
 William Edward Smith.
 Nels Louis Soderholm.
 John Francis Somers.
 Cyril Branstom Spicer.
 Lloyd Spencer Spooner.
 Nels Erick Stadig.
 Ben Stafford.
 John William Stanley.
 John Vincil Stark.
 Joseph Wheeler Starkey.
 Carl Henry Starrett.
 Frederick Wilhelm Tell Sterchi.
 Walter Aaron Stettler.
 Wilfred Hill Steward.
 Elam La Fayette Stewart.
 Jefferson Milford Stewart.
 Joseph Felix Stoeckel, jr.
 Harold Edwards Stow.
 Allen Louis Stowell.
 James Francis Straln.
 Glen Teter Strock.
 Joseph Alexander Stuart.
 Charles Francis Sullivan.
 Jackson Sullivan.
 Ernest Edmund Tabscott.
 Harold Mays Tague.
 Clyde Purcell Taylor.
 Llewellyn de Waele Tharp.
 Krauth Whitson Thom.
 Frank Leslie Thompson.
 Hamilton Thorn.
 Roy Milton Thoroughman.
 Truman Casper Thorson.
 Russell Conwell Throckmorton.
 Thomas Martin Tiernan.
 William McKinley Tonkay.
 William Melton Tow.
 Glen Ray Townsend.
 Leander Niles Trammell.
 Prince Edgerton Tripp.
 Joseph Leonard Tupper.
 Hiram Barricklow Turner.
 Roy F. Turrentine.
 Andrew Christian Tychsen.
 William Lane Tydings.
 Carl Marcus Ulsaker.
 Walter Julius Ungethuem.
 Charlie Anthony Valverde.

Lewis Morrell Van Gieson.
 Edward Phillip Wadden.
 Edward Ebert Walker.
 Ralph Bamford Walker.
 Dan Walsh, jr.
 Welcome Porter Waltz.
 Frank Ward.
 Ralph Leroy Ware.
 Aln Dudley Warnock.
 Preston Ballard Waterbury.
 Ralph Brittin Watkins.
 Clyde Clarkson Way.
 Smith Robbins Webb.
 John Merle Weir.
 George Randall Wells.
 Walter Herbert Wells.
 Earl Gordon Welsh.
 George Bernard Wescott.
 Chester Carlton Westfall.
 James Pearce Wharton.
 William Langley Wharton.
 Edwin Todd Wheatley.
 Ambrose Franklin White.
 Harry Alexander White.
 Rice Warren White.
 Oscar Julian Brittle Whitehurst.
 Robert Quail Whitten.
 Samuel Baxter Wiener.
 Sherman Edgar Willard.
 Laurin Lyman Williams.
 Samuel Tankersley Williams.
 Thomas Nottingham Williams.
 Raymond Jay Williamson.
 Herbert Edson Willis.
 Raymond Dresden Willis.
 Andrew McCorkle Wilson.
 Charles Henry Wilson.
 John Jay Wilson.
 Ralph Wiltamuth.
 John Hamilton Wise.
 Keith Bolling Wise.
 Lloyd Raymond Wolfe.
 Peter Thomas Wolfe.
 Harold Dean Woolley.
 Leighton E. Worthley.
 William Mason Wright, jr.
 Henry Frederick Wunder.
 George Taylor Wyche.
 Godfrey Neil Wyke.
 John Russell Young.
 Luke Donald Zech.
 Arnold William Zimmerman.
 Frank Thornton Addington.
 Rhodes Felton Arnold.
 Clark Milton Avery.
 Milton Orme Boone.
 Rufus Boylan.
 William Henry Brady.
 Everett Franklin Brooks.
 Everett Ernest Brown.
 Handy Vernon Brown.
 Samuel Lewis Buracker.
 Pierce Horton Camp.
 Joseph James Canella.
 Charles Carlton.
 Patrick Henry Cavanaugh.
 John Albion Chase.
 Louis Leonard Chatkin.
 Sidney Lanier Couner.
 George Raymond Connor.
 Carlos Oscar Cooley.
 Ira Dupree Coombs.
 Joseph Vincent Coughlin.
 Edwin Kenneth Crowley.
 Ivan Sanders Curtis.
 Frederick DeCaro.
 Frank Amedee Deroin.
 Howard Kirkbride Dilts.
 Arthur Francis Doran.
 Harry Grattan Dowdall.
 Fred During.
 James Douglas Edgar.
 George Joseph Engelthaler.
 Joseph Kahler Evans.
 Will Harley Evans.

Erle Dorr Ferguson.
 William Jay French.
 Melvin Earl Gillette.
 James Austin Gilruth.
 Clyde Grady.
 James Franklin Greene.
 Christian Gross.
 John Marvin Hagens.
 William Allen Hale.
 Bovey Mozart Hall.
 Kenneth Frederick Hanst.
 Ernest Thomas Hayes.
 Thomas Jefferson Heald.
 Charles August Hoss.
 William Agnew Howland.
 Edmund Fitzgerald Hubbard.
 William Harris Irvine.
 Harvey Turner Jensen.
 John Nettleton Johnson, jr.
 James Roger Kennedy.
 George Leroy King.
 Anthony Power Lagorio.
 Abraham Max Lawrence.
 Charles Cameron Lewis.
 William Bernard Lowery.
 Thomas Cleveland Lull.
 John Cawley MacArthur.
 Robert Battey McClure.
 Robert Nelson McConnell.
 Charles Raymond McKenney.
 Irving Marion McLeod.
 Thomas Edmund Mahoney.
 Frederick Christian Martsoff.
 Herbert Block Mayer.
 Harry Ernest Menezes.
 Thomas Ralph Miller.
 Eugene Erwin Morrow.
 John Curtis Newton.
 Hugh Campbell Parker.
 Rufus Arthur Parsons.
 Phillip Allen Payne.
 Eustace Maduro Peixotto.
 Joel DeWitt Pomerene.
 George Lyman Prindle.
 Oscar Ripley Rand.
 Thomas Walter Rikeman.
 William James Robertson.
 Jesse Andrew Rogers.
 Fay Ross.
 Arthur Dale Rothrock.
 Lewis L. Rupert.
 Arthur James Russell.
 Chambord Henry St. Germain.
 Frederic Albert Savage.
 William James Schaal.
 Carl Bierwirth Searing.
 Robert Sharp.
 Beverly Allison Shipp.
 Rexford Shores.
 Willis Earl Simpson.
 Willard Lapham Smith.
 Charles Seymour Stephens.
 Hardy Jackson Story.
 Frank Henry Strickland.
 James Nelvin Stuart.
 Orlen Nelson Thompson.
 Elmer Sharpe Van Benschoten.
 Bert S. Wampler.
 Edwin Uriah Owings Waters.
 John Moorman Whayne.
 Allan Sheldon Willis.
 Albert Theodore Wilson.
 Samuel Stafford Wolfe.
 Thomas Hugh Young.
 Clarence Howard Kells.
 Robert Jesse Whatley.
 Edward Watson Kelley.
 Luther Wesley Dear.

To be second lieutenants.

Claude Mitchell Adams.
 Ranald Trevor Adams.
 Samuel James Adams.
 Felix Marcus Alexander.
 Moses Alexander.
 Ralph Elmer Alexander.

Alfred Gideon Anderson.
 Oscar Lee Ansley.
 Walter Scott Arthur.
 Edward Clay Atkinson.
 Charles Backes.
 Clyde Girard Banks.
 Ellis Bates.
 Harold Albert Baumeister.
 Burns Beall.
 Charles Andrew Beaucond.
 Robert Clay Beckett.
 James Dallace Bender.
 Victor Emerson Biehn.
 Joseph Francis Binford.
 Lee Caraway Bizzell.
 Henry Joachim Boettcher.
 James Leland Bolt.
 Donald Van Niman Bonnett.
 Marvin Clifton Bradley.
 Jasper Ewing Brady, jr.
 Pembroke Augustine Brawner, jr.
 Rudolph William Broedlow.
 Graham Percy Brotherson.
 James Ainsworth Brown.
 John Joseph Buckley.
 William Henry Buechner.
 Rex Henry Burger.
 Edwin Moore Burnett.
 Frank L. Burns.
 Hal C. Bush.
 Charles Henry Calais.
 Albert Edgar Cannon.
 James Lebbeus Carman.
 Glenn Earl Carothers.
 Roy Alphonso Carter.
 Paul Duane Casey.
 Norman Crawford Caum.
 Ray Eric Cavenee.
 Holland Spencer Channess.
 Cyril Clifton Chandler.
 Francis Emerson Charlton.
 Bobb Childs.
 Thomas Harold Christian.
 Walter Norman Clinton.
 Howard Haines Cloud.
 Harry Luther Coates.
 Lawrence Lofton Cobb.
 Walter Bingham Cochran.
 Patrick Collins.
 Emmett Michael Connor.
 Kenton Parkes Cooley.
 John Edward Covington.
 Joseph Kenneth Creamer.
 Benjamin Mills Crenshaw.
 Harry Cullins.
 Frank Earl Curtis.
 Harold Arthur Daly.
 Justus Smith Davidson.
 Orin Lee Davidson.
 Thomas Hayden Davies.
 Clarence Turner Davis.
 Thomas Jefferson Davis.
 Lewis Andrus Day.
 George Stainback Deaderick.
 Gerald Bradford Devore.
 Fred Charles Dierstein.
 Harold Douglas Dinsmore.
 James Harrison Donahue.
 Joseph Saddler Dougherty.
 Joseph Addison Dubois.
 John Joseph Dunn.
 John DeLorme Eason.
 Chester Howard Elmes.
 Riley Finley Ennis.
 Benjamin Kenney Erdman.
 Francis Firmin Fainter.
 John Markham Ferguson.
 David Francis Finnerty.
 Harold Herbert Fisher.
 William Thrower Fitts, jr.
 William Joseph Flood.
 Arvid Edward Maurice Fogelberg.
 Thomas Jefferson Ford.
 Ivan Leon Foster.
 Neal Dow Franklin.

Harry Woldren French.
Edward Samuel Garner.
Julian Horace George.
Horace Napoleon Gibson.
Floyd Thomas Gillespie.
Norman Drysdale Gillet.
George Andrew Glover.
Edward Raymond Golden.
Harvey James Golightly.
Allen Agee Goodwyn.
Walter Franklin Graham.
Harold Frederick Greene.
Lester Erasmus Gruber.
Joseph John Gutkowski.
William Thomas Hailey.
Laurence Henry Hanley.
Charles Weess Hanna.
Harry Francis Hanson.
Louis Joseph Harant.
Furman Walker Hardee.
Herbert Hunter Harris.
James Willard Harris.
Lee Vyvian Harris.
Sterling Knox Harrod.
Charles Hardy Hart, jr.
John Beall Harvey.
Robert T. Hayes.
William Paul Hayes.
Allen Francis Haynes.
Roland Samuel Henderson.
John Walker Henson.
John Bartlett Hess.
Thomas Francis Hickey.
Joe Arthur Hinton.
Lewis Dabney Hixson.
Jack Clemens Hodgson.
Glenn Clinton Holcomb.
Ulmont William Holly.
Don Norris Holmes.
James Carl Horne.
Thomas Russell Howard.
James Bowcott Howat.
Thomas Aloysius Hoy.
Charles Franklin Hudson.
Ben Robert Jacobs.
Reuben Ellis Jenkins.
Hans Christian Jespersen.
Earle Albie Johnson.
Edward Clay Johnson.
Edwin Hugh Johnson.
Harrison William Johnson.
Lewis Peyton Jordan.
William Francis Joyce.
John Hamilton Judd.
William Lawrence Kay, jr.
Charles Leslie Keerans, jr.
Albert Gillian Kelly.
Maurice Stewart Kerr.
Wade Darragh Killen.
Harry Walter Killpack.
Edward Albert Kimball.
Sylvian Gaston Kindall.
Clarence Lee King.
Guy Malcolm Kinman.
Henry Lee Kinnison, jr.
Kenneth Edgar Kline.
Louis Braswell Knight.
Maurice Eugene Knowles.
Carter Marion Kolb.
Louis Urgel Labine.
Harold Joseph La Croix.
Edward Ames La Francis.
Frank La Rue.
Frank James Lawrence.
Rutledge Maurice Lawson.
Peter Le Toney.
Edwin Charles Lickman.
Leonard Eby Lilley.
Frank Blanton Lindley.
Lyle Sayers Lindsey.
Landon Johnson Lockett.
Russell Raymond Louden.
James Bernays Lowrey.
James Phillip Lyons.
William Young McBurney.
John Easton McCammon.
Thomas Florence McCarthy.
Donald Dewey McCaskey.
Herbert Joseph McChrystal.
Arthur Alexander McClaughry.
Earl Thomas McCullough.
Robert Mansfield McCurdy.
Thomas Joseph McDonald.
Winfield Rose McKay.
William Havelly McKee.
Alfred Edwin McKenney.
Francis Hugh Antony McKeon.
William Kennett McKittrick.
Roy Travis McLamore.
Frank Thomas Madigan.
Frank Norman Mallory.
James Robert Manees.
Frank Sims Mansfield.
William Alexander Marsh.
Floyd Marshall.
Peter Girardeau Marshall, jr.
William May.
Isaac Brown Mayers.
Vincent Douglas Mee.
Eugene Lemuel Miller.
John Spalding Miller.
Arvel Joshua Monger.
Robert Scurlark Moore.
Daniel Edward Morgan.
Harvey Thomas Morgan.
Evan Jervis Morris.
James Alva Murphey.
William Grove Murphy.
George Arthur Naylor.
John Joseph Nealon.
Mark Christian Neff.
Kent J. Nelson.
Robert LeRoy Nesbit.
James Harry Newberry.
Hyatt Floyd Newell.
Thomas Alfred Northam.
Francis Xavier Oberst.
Walter Patrick O'Brien.
Wiley Hubbard O'Mohundro.
Richard Evans Glasson Opie.
William Thomas O'Reilly.
Victor Otto Overcash.
Clifford Durward Overfelt.
Stanley Noble Partridge.
Andrew Paul Paulsen.
Eggleston Westley Peach.
Edwin Morgan Pendleton.
Clyde Hurschale Phillips.
Gaylord Leon Phipps.
Albert Pierson.
William Prentiss Pittman.
William Otis Poindexter.
Harold David Porter.
George Lawrence Potter.
Stanley Powloski.
Thomas Ewin Prather.
Forbie Hiram Privett.
Howard E. Pulliam.
Lemiel Lafayette Reece.
Charles Murray Rees.
Edward Julius Renth.
Joseph Walter Francis Resing.
James Caviness Rickner.
Don Riley.
Thomas Walter Roane.
Dayton Locke Robinson.
Henry William Robinson.
Frederick Buchanan Rosenbaum.
Albert Edmund Rothermich.
Garland Thomas Rowland.
Dorrance Scott Roysdon.
Jack Edmund Rycroft.
Joseph Aloysius St. Louis.
Augustus Dawson Sanders.
John Calvin Sandlin.
Richard Mathews Sandusky.
Warren Benedict Scanlon.
William Daniel Schas.
Andrew Jackson Schriver, jr.
Percy Waldo Seymour.

Walter Lee Sherfey.
 William Irving Sherwood.
 Lyle Meredon Shields.
 Edmund Rucks Shugart.
 Raymond Edward Shum.
 Charles Drysdale Simmonds.
 William Christopher Sinclair.
 Charles Richardson Smith.
 Clifford Augustus Smith.
 Horace Benjamin Smith.
 Leonard Roberts Smith.
 Oscar Stanley Smith.
 Victor Walter Smith.
 William Andrew Smith.
 Robert Homer Soule.
 William Henry Speidel.
 Samuel Wilber Stephens.
 Richard Francis Stone.
 Frank Wolle Stout.
 Aubrey Casey Strickland.
 Oscar Douglas Sugg.
 Allan Francis Sullivan.
 Grover Adlai Summa.
 Stowe Thompson Sutton.
 Harold Gaslin Sydenham.
 Aloysius Joseph Tagliabue.
 Keith Kirkman Tatom.
 Alfred Nelson Taylor.
 Paul Revere Taylor.
 Walter Moody Tenney.
 Elliott Raymond Thorpe.
 David Marsh Todd.
 Edgar Joseph Tulley.
 Harold Lewis Turner.
 Frederick Reinhold Undritz.
 Fred Pierce Van Duzee.
 George Van Studdiford.
 Frank Joseph Vida.
 William James Wagenknight, jr.
 Walter Cortland Wagner.
 Percival Adams Wakeman.
 Robert John Wallace.
 William Randolph Watson.
 John Weckerling.
 Charles Albert Welcker.
 Frederick William Wennerberg.
 Sidney Frank Wharton.
 William Lewis Wheeler.
 James Cecilius White.
 Archie Bird Whitlow.
 Cleon Lyle Williams.
 Frank Rate Williams.
 Jefferson Buckner Willis.
 Richard Randolph Winslow.
 Thomas Everett Winstead.
 Barlow Winston.
 Lloyd Nelson Winters.
 Arthur Henry Wolf.
 Dudley Hamilton Woodin.
 Robert Howard Wylie.
 Le Roy William Yarborough.
 Ivan Downes Yeaton.
 Joe Jones Yeats.
 Joseph Thaddeus Zak.
 Arthur Nicholas Ziegler.
 Wilson Stuart Zimmerman.
 William Keifer Behler.
 Helmuth Ernest Beine.
 Albert Edgar Billing.
 George Barnett Bloom.
 Clarence Harvey Bragg.
 Thomas Butler Burgess.
 Robert Wallace Burke.
 Jesse Earl Canary.
 Thomas James Chrisman.
 Leo George Clarke.
 Austin Murray Coates.
 Lawrence Cornwallis Collins.
 Willis Clark Conover.
 Eugene Robert Cowles.
 Harold Baxter Crowell.
 Ernest Arthur DeWitt.
 Hugh Carlton Dorrien.
 Mark Hinstead Doty.

Carlisle Clyde Dusenbury.
 Henry Bosard Ellison.
 Thearl Ward Essig.
 Yates Douglas Fetterman.
 Thomas Henry Foster.
 Howard Nathaniel Frissell.
 Harold Almon Gardyne.
 Richard Sylvester Gessford.
 William John Hardy.
 Jessie Thomas Harris.
 Fremont Byron Hodson.
 Andrew Daniel Hopping.
 Cecil E. Inman.
 John William Irwin.
 Albert Henry Johnson.
 William Henry Johnson.
 William Thomas Johnson.
 Howard Ayil Worrell Kates.
 William Stanard Keller.
 Fredrik Lorentsen Knudsen, jr.
 Clyde Harrison Lamb.
 Ralph Floyd Love.
 Edwin Joseph McAllister.
 James Bryan McDavid.
 Robert Don McKnight.
 Edwin Thomas May.
 Earl Monroe Miner.
 Joseph Elmer Monhollan.
 James Webb Newberry.
 David Ray Nimocks.
 Fred Harold Norris.
 Millard Fillmore Willot Oliver.
 Elmer Dane Pangburn.
 Edwin Karl Pohlson.
 Patrick Francis Powers.
 Sam Purswell.
 Charles Augustus Reif.
 Harry George Rennagel.
 Robert Louis Renth.
 Philip Wallace Ricamore.
 Maurice Rose.
 Rafael Louis Salzmann.
 William Barmore Sharp.
 Robert MacKenzie Shaw.
 Raymond Leroy Shoemaker.
 Howard Worcester Trefry.
 Walter Kendall Wheeler.
 Pearne Clark Wilders.
 Chester Morse Willingham.
 Raymond Carl Zettel.
 Harold Patrick Henry.
 Roy Winne Barhydt.
 Leslie Emmett Mabus.
 Joseph Jacob Billo.
 Robert Francis Watt.
 William Carleton McFadden.
 Claude Eugene Haswell.
 Frank Needham Roberts.
 Charles Frederick Beattie.
 Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck.
 Crump Garvin.
 Hamilton Peyton Ellis.
 Thomas Dresser White.
 Frederick Nixon Harris.
 Dwight Acker Rosebaum.
 Donald Robert Van Sickler.
 Richard Candler Singer.
 John Henry Hofferker Hall.
 Aladin James Hart.
 Powell Paxton Applewhite.
 Jefferson Denman Box.
 William Richter Tomey.
 Joseph Honore Rousseau, jr.
 Frederick Seymour Dixon.
 Maurice Wiley Daniel.
 Alexander Hamilton Perwein.
 Tracy Enfield Davis.
 Oscar Raymond Johnston.
 Charles Whitney West.
 Park Brown Herrick.
 Herbert Carl Reuter.
 Helmer William Lystad.
 Harold Edward Smyser.
 Esher Claflin Burkart.

Thomas Eglinton Whitehead.
 Alexander George.
 Charles Kenon Gailey, jr.
 Mortimer Frederick Wakefield.
 Francis William Farrell.
 Wilmer Brinton Merritt.
 Harry Clark Wiselhart.
 Harold Julius Chapman.
 John Irvin Gregg, jr.
 John Russell, jr.
 Charles Merton Adams, jr.
 Frank Hoben Blodgett.
 John Ferral McBlain.
 Richard Meade Costigan.
 Gustave Harold Vogel.
 Basil Girard Thayer.
 Edward Joseph Sullivan.
 James Perrine Barney, jr.
 Wilbur Sturtevant Nye.
 Charles Harlan Swartz.
 Leland Stuart Smith.
 Wayne Latta Barker.
 Francis Selwyn Gay.
 Carl Frederick Duffner.
 Wilburn Vastine Lunn.
 Millard Pierson.
 Francis Ward Walker.
 Harold Oliver Sand.
 Cyril Drew Pearson.
 Raymond Henry Reece.
 Harlan Thurston McCormick.
 Henry Peter Burgard, 2d.
 Alexander Gilbert Sand.
 Ray Olander Welch.
 George William Richard Wilson.
 John Lamont Davidson.
 Julian Erskine Raymond.
 Abraham Sheridan Abel.
 George Honnen.
 Charles Porter Amazeen.
 Edward Thomas Williams.
 Frank Thweatt Searcy.
 George William Bailey, jr.
 Henry Kirk Williams, jr.
 Alan Lockhart Fulton.
 Terrence John Tully.
 William McKinley Laumeister.
 Paul Clarence Kelly.
 Sidney Ginsberg.
 James Miller Rudolph.
 William Earl Crist.
 William Roe Brewster.
 Claude Monroe McQuarrie.
 Charles William Smith.
 William Lemuel Mitchell.
 Harrison Guinther Travis.
 Escalus Emmert Elliott.
 Milton Cogswell Shattuck.
 Joseph Vincent de Paul Dillon.
 Francis James Starr.
 William Edward Ryan.
 Hayden Adriance Sears.
 Newton Nevada Jacobs.
 John Thomas Lynch.
 John Black Reybold.
 John Raoul Guiteras.
 William Dickey Long.
 Henry Irving Hodes.
 Clifford Augustine Taney, jr.
 Paul Earl Tombaugh.
 Harvey Kenneth Greenlaw.
 William Joel Tudor Yancey.
 Leon Eugene Lichtenwalter.
 Sidney Rae Hinds.
 John Aloysius McNulty.
 Halley Grey Maddox.
 Snowden Ager.
 John English Nelson.
 Randolph Burt Wilkinson.
 Dean LeRoy Sharar.
 John Talbot Curtis.
 George Hasbrouck Krause.
 Harold Todd Turnbull.
 Hugo Peoples Rush.
 John William Vickers.

Wray Bertrand Avera.
 Charles Fox Ivins.
 Walter Daniel Bule.
 John Taylor Ward.
 John Elmer Reiersen.
 Edward Maurice Flexner, jr.
 Henry Jackson Hunt, jr.
 George Huston Bare.

PHILIPPINE SCOUTS.

Cadet Pastor Martellino y Concepcion to be second lieutenant.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

To be major general.

John Francis O'Ryan.

To be brigadier general.

Frank Thomas Hines.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 29, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pastor of Calvary Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the wonder of life, but stay with us. Only in Thy mercy can we live. Thy compassion is new every morning. May we be men of the day dawn, living in the inspiration of hope and faith until the shadows flee away, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE PACKERS.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article published in a Washington paper that reflects to a certain extent upon this House, and contains statements that I have never made. In fairness to the Ways and Means Committee I think the article ought to be read to the House, and I would like to have a few minutes to comment on the same.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Seven minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to address the House for seven minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, what is the article about?

Mr. McCLINTIC. It is about the packers having control and causing certain action to be taken, attributing certain statements to me which I did not make, neither do I know anything about.

Mr. MADDEN. Does it amount to a question of privilege?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I do not know that it is exactly a question of privilege, but I thought as it made insinuations against the members of the Ways and Means Committee it ought to be brought to the attention of the House. I want to deal fairly with the House, but if the gentleman from Illinois wants to object, all right.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk read the article referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Washington Herald, January 29, 1921.]

McCLINTIC STILL CONTINUES HIS ONE-MAN FILIBUSTER—WON'T ALLOW EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN RECORD AND FORCES ATTENDANCE.

Representative McCLINTIC, of Oklahoma, yesterday continued his filibuster begun the day before in the House, refusing to allow any extension of remarks in the RECORD, and keeping Members running back and forth from their offices to the House Chamber throughout the day with points of no quorum.

Just what McCLINTIC is on the war path about is still a mystery, since he is keeping his own counsel, but that his ire has been aroused there can be no question.

His friends say he was "double-crossed" by the Democratic committee on committees, which promised him an assignment on the Agriculture Committee and then decided to make no committee assignments until next session.

BLANTON HALTS SPEECHES.

While the committee ascribed its action to "policy," McCLINTIC's friends intimate it really was the result of efforts of the packers' lobby to prevent the Oklahoman, who is in favor of regulating the

packing industry, from gaining a place on the Agriculture Committee, where the bill is being considered.

McCLINTIC twice attempted to make a prepared speech on emergency tariff legislation, but was cut off by objection of BLANTON, of Texas. It is understood the speech will contain sharp criticism of Representative GARNER, of Texas, ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, for getting off the Democratic reservation by favoring the emergency tariff measure.

GARNER, who is in line for the House leadership in the next Congress in the event CLAUDE KITCHIN is physically unable to assume the post, also is chairman of the committee on committees which failed to assign McCLINTIC to the Agriculture Committee.

McCLINTIC has resigned from all his committee assignments, including the Joint Senate and House Committee on Printing, the House Committee on Printing, and the Committee on Elections No. 1, and apparently is determined to fight out the issue to the end.

Representative WALSH (Republican), of Massachusetts, charged McCLINTIC with throwing a monkey wrench in the legislative machinery to air a personal grievance, but the Oklahoman replied that he was merely trying to help the Republicans carry out their campaign pledges for a great wave of economy and to keep a quorum present to transact the Nation's business.

McCLINTIC called attention to an extension of remarks made by a "certain Senator" Thursday, taking up 90 pages of the RECORD at a "cost of several thousand dollars," and declared he intended to put a stop to the practice, so far as the House is concerned.

The RECORD disclosed that the remarks were made by Senator SHERMAN, of Illinois, in defense of the packers and in opposition to the Kenyon-Kendrick packer regulation bill which passed the Senate Monday.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the reason that I have brought this to the attention of this body is that I have never in any way connected any Member of this body with the packers or their efforts to control certain legislation. I have been informed, and it is generally known, that there are in and around this Capitol certain agents or certain men who are interested in keeping the packing industry from being regulated. I am of the opinion that years ago the banks, or those who own the banks, objected to Government regulation and control. I am now of the opinion that if anyone should seek to destroy that regulation and control the honest bankers would object, realizing that wildcat banks would soon come in and destroy the industry.

I am likewise of the opinion that that same statement applies to many other kinds of activities in this Nation. I can see no reason why an honest packer would not be willing to have his business honestly regulated in order that his business might receive the protection it is entitled to in the future. [Applause.]

I do not think that statement ought to be made against the members of the Ways and Means Committee. I merely wanted to say to the House that I am not responsible for the statement in that article which refers to the packers. You and I know that where there is a lot of smoke there must be a little fire. I am in favor of the regulation of the packers, and I do not know if they have brought any pressure to bear to keep me off of any committee or not. I do not intend to impede the progress of this House, and the only reason that I have been doing some work here lately is because I want the House run in the regular way and to cut out some of the abuses that I have called to the attention of the House from time to time. I felt that the members of the Ways and Means Committee, against whom this statement is indirectly made, should have the benefit of this statement from me.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SISSON reserved all points of order.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15872, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, when we concluded yesterday afternoon the item on page 4, lines 11 and 12, was under consideration. It provided for an interpreter to the legation and consulate general to Persia, at a salary of \$2,000 per year. I had made the point of order against the paragraph for the reason that it was legislation unauthorized on an appropriation bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] had conceded that there was no law authorizing it, and had asked for

a few moments to explain certain other items. The Chair had not yet ruled that the paragraph was out of order, and I think at this time the ruling of the Chair, which was based upon the concession of the gentleman from Massachusetts, should go in the RECORD to show that the point of order was sustained.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman states the matter correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from Texas is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Interpreter to legation and consulate general to Bangkok, Siam, \$2,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph, that there is no law authorizing an interpreter to legation and consulate general to Bangkok, Siam, at a salary of \$2,000 per year.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 10 student interpreters at the embassy to China, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Chinese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the embassy and consulates in China, at \$1,500 each, \$15,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter at the embassy or consulates in China so long as his services may be required within a period of five years.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by law.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters in China, at the rate of \$350 per annum each, \$3,500.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by law.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I concede all of the points of order that the gentleman may see fit to make in wrecking this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee must proceed regularly. Does the gentleman concede this point of order is well taken?

Mr. ROGERS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For six student interpreters at the embassy to Japan, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Japanese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the embassy and consulates in Japan, at \$1,500 each, \$9,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter at the embassy or consulates in Japan so long as his services may be required within a period of five years.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph just read, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is unauthorized by law.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters at the embassy to Japan, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$1,200.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by law.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For four student interpreters at the legation to Turkey, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the language of Turkey and any other language that may be necessary to qualify them for service as interpreters to the legation and consulates in Turkey, at \$1,500 each, \$6,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter to the legation and consulates in Turkey so long as his services may be required within a period of five years.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by law.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters at the legation to Turkey, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$800.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, unauthorized by law.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, of course this is not legislation on an appropriation bill, as far as this paragraph goes.

Mr. BLANTON. Also that it is not germane. There are no student interpreters at the legation to Turkey, and therefore it would be unauthorized to appropriate the cost of tuition for them.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the point of order that the gentleman raised was that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and it is not.

Mr. BLANTON. And that there is no authority of law for it and that it is not germane.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman did not make that point of order. If he makes it, I concede it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No person drawing the salary of interpreter or student interpreter as above provided shall be allowed any part of the salary appropriated for any secretary of legation or other officer.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the paragraph is out of order because it is legislation on an appropriation bill, unauthorized by law, that it is not germane to the bill or to the paragraph, and that there is no authority of law for it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, that particular paragraph is a limitation. In view of the fact that the gentleman has smashed his way through all of these interpreters up to this point, I do not know whether there is very much utility in retaining the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, \$39,500.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The totals, I understand, are to be corrected by the Clerk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is authorized to correct all totals. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERS FOR STUDENT INTERPRETERS AT EMBASSIES.

For rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the embassy to Japan, \$1,200.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to lines 13, 14, and 15, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, unauthorized by law, and that it is not germane.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I combat both points of order. This is not legislation on an appropriation bill, and certainly is germane to the general subject matter of the bill under consideration.

Mr. BLANTON. And that it is unauthorized by law. The gentleman failed to catch that point.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman did not make that point of order. I submit that he ought to be confined to a point of order and not be allowed to pop up two or three times trying to think of some additional ones.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I would like to have the clerk report the point of order as I made it, so that he would be satisfied that I did make the point of order, that it was without authority of law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. It appears to the Chair, and he asks the gentleman from Massachusetts for information, that the appropriation seems to be for rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the Embassy to Japan. Are those interpreters being used—

Mr. BLANTON. May I make a suggestion to the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not finished his interrogation. Were these quarters being used and have they been used for the student interpreters at Japan?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That has been considered as being the continuation of an existing proposition. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts think that it would be justified in the present instance as a continuation of a project?

Mr. ROGERS. I will be entirely frank with the Chair and will say that I had not supposed this item would be in order

for the reason the Chair suggests. My contention was that the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas did not attack the item in any vulnerable point.

The CHAIRMAN. If subsequently made the Chair would have entertained it in any event. Now, the Chair is trying to obtain information and whether the objection in its fullest form is well taken. And the Chair is asking the gentleman from Massachusetts what his suggestion is with respect to that proposition?

Mr. ROGERS. Well, in my judgment, this item is not defensible if the point of order is specifically raised against it. There is no authority of law on the basis on which this item is presented. In other words, that there is no continuous obligation upon the United States—

The CHAIRMAN. Sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the legation to Turkey, \$800.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that there is no authority of law for this item; it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Massachusetts say?

Mr. ROGERS. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, FOREIGN MISSIONS.

To enable the President to provide, at the public expense, all such stationery, blanks, records, and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several embassies and legations in the transaction of their business, and also for rent, repairs, postage, telegrams, furniture, typewriters, including exchange of same, messenger service, compensation of kavasses, guards, dragomans, and porters, including compensation of interpreters, and the compensation of dispatch agents at London, New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans, and for travelling and miscellaneous expenses of embassies and legations, and for printing in the Department of State, and for loss on bills of exchange to and from embassies and legations, including such loss on bills of exchange to officers of the United States Court for China, and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized, \$800,000: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of any sum or sums appropriated for contingent expenses, foreign missions, shall be expended for salaries or wages of persons not American citizens performing clerical services, whether officially designated as clerks or not, in any foreign mission.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph, for the following reason: That the following portions of the paragraph are unauthorized by law, is legislation upon an appropriation bill without authority of law, to wit, beginning in line 7, the following language: "including such loss on bills of exchange to officers of the United States Court for China"; and, beginning in line 11, the following: "\$800,000," for the reason that it has without authority of law been increased by this committee from the sum of \$398,585 to \$800,000; and the further language, which is legislation and which has no authority of law, to wit, beginning in line 11: "*Provided*, That hereafter no part of any sum or sums appropriated for contingent expenses, foreign missions, shall be expended for salaries or wages of persons not American citizens performing clerical services, whether officially designated as clerks or not, in any foreign mission."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas make the point of order against the entire paragraph because of the parts specified?

Mr. BLANTON. I do, particularly because of the raise by the committee from \$398,585 to \$800,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the gentleman understood. Does the gentleman raise the point of order against the particular language to which he called attention, or does he object to the paragraph because it contains that language?

Mr. BLANTON. I object to the whole paragraph because it contains the provisions mentioned, and specially because of the raise in the amount from \$398,585 to \$800,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Sustained.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the Chair permit me to be heard on this point?

The CHAIRMAN. The first part of the paragraph does contain some legislation—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Where does it contain legislation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is referring to the language of the proviso in making that ruling, and the Chair has been advised by the adviser to the Chair that certain language contained in lines 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, on the seventh page, is new legislation, and therefore—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I heard the Chair state that something in the paragraph was legislation, but I could not hear what it was.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was advised by the parliamentary clerk that the language, and the Chair asked the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts in regard to it, commencing with the word "and," at the end of line 5, down to and including the figures "\$800,000," in line 11, and also the word "hereafter," in line 12, are all new.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, plainly, Mr. Chairman, that is not legislation. It is an appropriation, but whether authorized by law I do not know, but it is not legislation. It is merely an appropriation. The proviso is merely a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The proviso, the Chair thinks—well, he will not pass upon that. The objection is to the entire paragraph because of this matter, and the Chair believes it is the duty of the Chair to sustain the objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the Chair hear me briefly on the portions of the paragraph that relate to loss on bills of exchange?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts admit that part of the paragraph is subject to a point of order?

Mr. ROGERS. I am inclined to think that the proviso in its present form, because it contains the word "hereafter," is subject to the point of order, but before preparing an amendment to meet that particular objection I should like to learn the mind of the Chair in respect to the language of the substantive part of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair just called attention, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Illinois, to a part of the paragraph that the Chair is advised is subject to a point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the Chair hear me upon that phase of the question?

The CHAIRMAN. Why, certainly, as to the language commencing with the word "and," in the seventh line, and ending with the amount of \$800,000, in line 11, and as to the word "hereafter," on line 12 of the proviso.

Mr. ROGERS. With respect to the matter of loss on bills of exchange, it is necessary every quarter for every foreign agency of the United States, whether an embassy, legation, or consulate, or the United States Court in China, to forward to the seat of government a statement showing the receipts or expenditures which have been involved in the accounts of the particular office for the previous quarter. In the event that the receipts exceed the expenditures in the particular office, it is necessary for that office to send by draft an amount representing the excess.

In the event, on the other hand, that the expenses exceed the receipts, it is necessary for that office to draw a draft on Washington in order to make up the deficiency. That process, even under the normal banking conditions throughout the world, involves a certain loss in exchange. In normal years it has been as low as \$8,000. For the current year, because of the abnormal and upset international banking situation, the necessary amount greatly exceeds that sum. But an appropriation of this character is essential for the carrying on of our diplomatic business throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, there has been recently a line of rulings upon this general type of question, which, it seems to me, makes this item in order on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair ask the gentleman if this language is entirely new? Has it ever been contained in previous appropriation bills?

Mr. ROGERS. This language has been contained for the past 10 years, at least, in every appropriation bill.

Mr. BLANTON. What about the word "hereafter"?

Mr. ROGERS. I am dealing, if the gentleman will permit, only with the language in the substantive part of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not quite understand the gentleman from Massachusetts. Will he be kind enough to restate it?

Mr. ROGERS. I stated to the Chair that this particular language contained in lines 6 to 11 has been carried yearly in the appropriation bill for many years.

The CHAIRMAN. And the appropriation itself has been carried?

Mr. ROGERS. The appropriation itself has been carried.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure the gentleman does not want to carry that impression, because upon reflection he will remember that while there has been an appropriation heretofore, it heretofore has been \$398,585, and now it is \$800,000.

Mr. ROGERS. The amount of the appropriation presents no question of a point of order. There is no statutory limitation of the amount to be carried in this item, although the gentleman, perhaps inadvertently, stated that there was a statutory limitation. This amount varies from year to year. I do not recall that for years it has run twice the same. In other words, this amount necessarily rises and falls with the demands upon the Diplomatic Service.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] that it seems to the Chair that the explanation made indicates quite clearly that this is a necessary incident of the legations, no matter in what form it may be, and I think the point of order as against that language is not well taken as it was stated. I think I know what the gentleman from Texas is going to say about it. Of course, the word "hereafter" still carries an objection.

Mr. ROGERS. I have an amendment prepared to deal with the point of order against the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The record should be kept clear, and the Chair sustains the objection of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on this. But if the Chair has already decided—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman as soon as this amendment is read.

Mr. MADDEN. If the Chair has already decided, of course I do not care to take up the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman's request. He will be glad to hear the gentleman. I did not understand that he desired to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not care to be heard, inasmuch as the Chair has already decided the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair states that he did not understand the gentleman desired to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ROGERS: Insert on page 4, after line 9, the following paragraph:

Mr. ROGERS. It should be page 6, after line 18.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Did not the Chair sustain the point of order to the paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's amendment seeks to begin in the middle of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear what the amendment is. The Clerk will read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, FOREIGN MISSIONS.

To enable the President to provide, at the public expense, all such stationery, blanks, records, and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several embassies and legations in the transaction of their business, and also for rent, repairs, postage, telegrams, furniture, typewriters, including exchange of same, messenger service, compensation of kavasses, guards, dragomans, and porters, including compensation of interpreters, and the compensation of dispatch agents at London, New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans, and for traveling and miscellaneous expenses of embassies and legations, and for printing in the Department of State, and for loss on bills of exchange to and from embassies and legations, including such loss on bills of exchange to officers of the United States Court for China, and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized, \$800,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum appropriated for contingent expenses, foreign missions, shall be expended for salaries or wages of persons not American citizens performing clerical services, whether officially designated as clerks or not, in any foreign mission.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but this use of the point of order, of course, can be of great benefit to the people and to the country and can also be used in great damage to the public welfare.

Now, America is in this kind of a position: She is seeking to expand her foreign trade, and the prosperity of this country is going to depend upon what success the United States shall make in the next three or four years in the expansion of its foreign trade.

In order to secure foreign business it is necessary for the United States to have some sort of relations with these people. America must have her representatives there, and unless she does she will find herself outstripped in the race for commerce and trade. If we are to have employment for our people, if we are to secure prosperity in this country, we must have foreign markets.

Constantly striking out important matters in the bill means that there must be more work for the Congress to do. For my-

self I want to go on record in favor of legislation making sufficient appropriations to put America to the forefront in her foreign relations. I repeat I am not a member of this committee; I am not interested in the personnel of the men who make up the State Department. For my part I think a lot of the men in the State Department need to be "worked over," as the expression is—a lot of men in foreign posts upon whom we depend to transact business for the people of this country who do not go to their offices probably until 11 or 12 o'clock; and they will not answer the correspondence of business men promptly. They will be there probably until 2 o'clock in the afternoon, and then they are gone. It is necessary for some men to do the society act because it is necessary for our representatives abroad to conform to the customs of the various peoples of the world, and it would be just as much out of place to put to the task a stern business man to transact diplomatic relations with some of our sister nations as it would be to try to sell silk hats down in Oklahoma or to sell cowboy boots on Broadway, New York.

But here, my friends, is the proposition: America, if she succeeds, if her merchant marine amounts to anything, has got to have friendly relations with the foreign nations of the world, and you can not have those relations in competition with Great Britain unless you have the people who can promote them. For centuries in Great Britain they have gone down to the sea. That has been the business of the British, to go down to the sea to develop commerce and business for the country.

If America is to succeed she must send her best men, her trained men, down to the sea, where they can get into friendly relations with the people of the world. The people of the world will not trade with America unless they like American business men and their methods. You can no more do business with Latin America by the stern business methods which apply in this country than you can fly, because you have got to conform to the habits and the ways of the people of those countries; you have got to have that polite, suave manner that they have.

Gentlemen say, "We will strike out all this legislation because it is subject to a point of order." I have no criticism of that. That is a defense put here as one of the wise rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOWN. It is a wise provision, but the very best provision you may have may be used for the detriment of the welfare of the country, and in this legislation here, if gentlemen want to get the right kind of reform, my idea of it is to separate the diplomatic department from the commercial department. You can take the commercial end of the business. When a business man of America writes a letter for information he wants prompt information; he wants it now. He does not want that letter to lie around for 8 or 10 days while the man who is to answer it plays society. He wants the information, and he wants it at once. You must necessarily have men who will and can do the polite things, men who are trained in doing society in order to maintain the proper respect of foreigners for our country. My idea about this legislation in this appropriation bill is that we ought to be economical in the expenditure of our money; we ought to get our money's worth, and we ought to provide only for necessary service; but at the same time we ought not to cripple this, which I think is one of the most important departments of our Government. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this House has selected, out of its membership of 435 Congressmen, 35 Members in whom is lodged the sole power of appropriation. That is the greatest power in this Congress. I voted for that proposition in the interest of economy. I believe, if properly exercised, it is going to result in much-needed economy. But we were then given to understand when we were called upon to vote for that proposition that this committee would be limited absolutely to appropriating money that was authorized by legislation passed by other legislative committees of the House. If you give this committee of 35 members legislative authority as well as the power of appropriation, then you might as well disband every other committee. You might as well send home to their respective districts every other of the 400 Members of Congress. They would be no longer necessary.

This committee seeks by this amendment to raise the sum that has always been appropriated in normal times for this particular item from \$398,585 to the great sum of \$800,000. What are some of the items for which this \$800,000 is to be paid? Look at the paragraph: Stationery, books, flags, signs, messenger service—and we know something about the messenger service—compensation of kavasses—

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman explain that word?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment, please. Compensation of kavasses, guards, dragomans, and porters, and so on, \$800,000.

Now I know my good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown] well enough to know that he does not approve of all of the expenses that were brought about by that great retinue of Americans we had over in France at palatial hotels, their expenses amounting to \$1,651,191.09. I am one of the Congressmen who believe that Woodrow Wilson is the greatest living man in American to-day [applause], sick though he may be; but yet I do not approve of that expense account that his followers over there caused to be paid out of the Public Exchequer of the people. There have been too many servants over there; there have been too many compensations to kavasses [laughter] and guards and dragomans and porters. This distinguished subcommittee of five that has passed upon this bill has seen fit to increase this appropriation from \$398,585 to \$800,000. There is too much wine bought there in entertainments. There is too much high society there. As to the committee, I know some of the members are in high society here. They think that because they indulge in high society here our representatives over there should also indulge in high society in the courts of kings. But I want to remind my good friends who are taking the people's money out of a Treasury that is now depleted and facing a deficit of \$3,000,000,000 that high society in the United States, in a Republic, is very different to high society in the courts of kings. I want to tell you that the people of the United States will not approve of this item. They will not approve of the action of this committee in raising this amount from \$398,000 to \$800,000. I get along without indulging in high society. I am one man on the floor of this House who works 8, 10, 12, and 14 hours a day trying to save the people's money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

We are appropriating under new conditions. We started in at the last session of the Congress to bring about a great reform, the reform of the budget. So far as the executive portion of that reform was concerned, we were unable to perfect it, owing to a disagreement with regard to one matter as between the Executive and the Congress; but the House of Representatives, by a very large majority, passed a self-denying ordinance—seriously self-denying on the part of some 150 or 160 Members of the House on both sides, who voluntarily deprived themselves of a large part of their authority in the interest of a system which we hope will mark a great improvement in the methods of appropriating. There may be some doubt and question with regard to that, but at least that is our expectation and our hope, and the people of the country expect us to give the new policy a fair trial.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will let me finish, then I will be glad to yield. When the new session convened there was a question, the executive budget having failed, as to whether or not it was wise and proper that we should go on with our part of the reform, whether, handicapped as we knew we would be, it was the part of wisdom for us to go through with the program that we had adopted, or whether, owing to the failure of the executive portion of the budget, we should rescind the action we had taken. It was not only a matter of practical legislation but it was partly a matter of politics; not partisan politics, but a matter for proper political consideration. What would the country think of us, having adopted what the country believes is a great reform, whether we are all convinced of it or not, an election having passed, if we should rescind the action taken in the direction of reform and go back to the old and what is in the opinion of a majority of the people of the country the discredited practice of appropriations by many committees.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. It did not seem to me that we were justified in doing that. It seemed to me that whatever the handicaps were, whatever the difficulty in the way, having started on the path of a real, far-reaching, and exceedingly important reform, we should not turn our backs upon that part of it which has to do with our activities simply because we have not been able for the time being to complete the reform in all respects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. My time has not been extended, and I will say frankly to the gentleman that while I would like to go on, I could not yield to the gentleman until after I had yielded to other gentlemen who have requested me to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection to the request that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, will the gentleman from Mississippi excuse me for a moment until I can complete a rather brief statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. Then I will be glad to answer these questions.

Under these conditions we took up our work. Having some responsibility in the matter, I took the trouble to say to the members of the Committee on Appropriations that I hoped nothing new in the way of an appropriation not clearly authorized by law would go on their bills; second, that nothing in the way of new legislation should be undertaken on the appropriation bills, no matter how much demand there might be for it; and, third, that in reporting their bills they should, so far as it was possible, eliminate items subject to a point of order not absolutely essential, even though they had been carried on bills in times past.

Manifestly it was not possible, and is not possible, for the legislative committees of the House to bring in at this session complete, thoroughgoing, all-embracing legislation covering the activities of the departments for which we appropriate. The very fact that in the past the committees did not guard their appropriation items with legislative authority is an evidence of how difficult it is to cover them all with substantive legislative provisions. I believed, however, that if the new and enlarged Committee on Appropriations brought in its bills stripped of everything unnecessary, extraneous, and new, this committee was entitled to and would, I hope, receive at least as much consideration on the part of the House as the committees formerly reporting these bills have received. This bill last year came from a committee that had legislative authority to protect its items, but the committee had not protected them with appropriate legislation; and gentlemen, as they will remember, allowed that committee to pass its bill with all those items upon it.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; we had a special rule for them.

Mr. MONDELL. A few items went out, but in the main all these bills passed last year as they have passed year after year, subject to many points of order that were not made. The bills have heretofore been reported by committees that have authority to legislate and thus protect their appropriation items, but they have left many of them unprotected, and the House has been good-natured and kindly and considerate, as I think it should have been, and as I think it should be now. I am not going to impugn the motives of gentlemen—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall not impugn anyone's motives, because I realize the importance of protecting the jurisdiction of the legislative committees.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. I would approve points of order made against items not essential to the business of the department for which we are appropriating, even though it had been carried on the bill in the past.

Now I yield briefly to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman speaks of defending the jurisdiction of the committee. Under the old system that question was not involved when legislative items were brought into the House, but is involved under the new system, and that, in my opinion, is the source of the whole trouble.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows that in the new Congress legislative committees will have abundant opportunity to bring in legislation covering and providing for the activities of the departments over which they have jurisdiction. If in the special session Members of these committees do perform that duty and make provision for the protection of necessary items, then I think gentlemen will be justified in insisting that the appropriation bills shall not carry items that are not provided for and protected by legislation.

Until the time has come when the committees charged with responsibility and armed with authority have the time to care-

fully prepare and bring in the legislation that will make necessary items in order, I think we ought to be as considerate of the Appropriations Committee as we have been of the other committees in the past and allow the committee to have its items considered on their merits. Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman from Wyoming that this Congress should be as considerate of the Appropriations Committee as they have been of the other Appropriation Committees in the past. But it was distinctly understood, and I believe the gentleman from Wyoming will agree with me, that when that committee was created, that when it began to function in the way it was intended to function, that no legislation should be brought in on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MONDELL. No one has brought in any legislation.

Mr. GARNER. I want to call attention to the fact that there was a special rule brought in for the purpose of making legislation in order on the sundry civil bill, which was indefensible under that agreement. [Applause.] You brought in a rule to put legislation on the sundry civil bill, which was directly in violation of the agreement which you say was made.

Mr. MONDELL. That was done not only on the approval but largely at the suggestion of the legislative committee having the matter in charge. There was a complete understanding with regard to it, and a complete approval of it by the committee that had legislative jurisdiction.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield? Let us have this understood. If I understand the gentleman, if this system continues in the House, and when the appropriate committee—the Judiciary Committee or the Naval Affairs Committee or the Military Affairs Committee—shall go out and consider propositions and come back and ask the Rules Committee to make it in order to go on an appropriation bill, the gentleman would favor that system.

Mr. MONDELL. Not at all; the gentleman knows as a practical legislator and an excellent one—he knows perfectly well that it would be utterly impossible for these legislative committees in the time we have in this session of Congress to prepare and bring in and for the House and Senate to pass a complete legislative program to cover these items. It could not be done in the time at our command, and therefore we must bear with the situation for the time being, only insisting that the committees shall not bring in new appropriations or legislative items not essential to the transaction of the business of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have one minute more, in order to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. In the early part of the gentleman's remarks he used the word "reform" several times. I take it that the gentleman had reference to the Appropriation Committee of 35. What I want to ask the gentleman is under the methods now in use by the Appropriation Committee, wherein does it differ from the legislative appropriation committees that have heretofore been bringing in bills? Wherein is the difference between the activity of one and the activity of the other?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows that I am not one of those who was absolutely convinced that the single Appropriations Committee was an essential part of the budget reform, but it is true that almost every advocate and student of the budget considers a single Appropriations Committee as an essential part of the system, and I accept that judgment. At least I am convinced that we should, and I am quite certain we shall, try out the single committee in the next Congress. Gentlemen may not have faith in it, but the country expects us to try out this feature of a budget system, and we shall not disappoint the country in this regard.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, to-day marks the eightieth birthday of our universally beloved colleague, Maj. CHARLES M. STEDMAN, of North Carolina. [Applause.] I voice the combined sentiment of every Member of this body in extending to him on his anniversary our unreserved and spontaneous congratulations and good wishes. [Applause.] He is the only surviving Member in either branch of Congress of that valiant host of men who fought in the Confederate Army. And while he has never and never will surrender his conviction of the justice of the cause for which he and his comrades endured so much, there is no man in this Republic to-day who loves his whole country with a more profound devotion. [Applause.] We not only felicitate our colleague upon his natal day, but we congratulate the great constituency which he represents and the

Commonwealth which gave him birth upon having in him a representative of lofty ideals and splendid attainments, a spokesman whose heart knows no guile, an exemplar of that none too rare type, an upright Christian gentleman. May God graciously give him yet many years to enjoy the universal confidence, respect, and veneration not only of his own people but of the country at large.

Where Maj. STEDMAN walks, there goes a man. [Applause.]
Mr. SMALL rose.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MANN of Illinois). The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.
Mr. ROGERS. Then I modify the request to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I take the privilege of commenting briefly upon this supposed legislative reform to which the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has referred. I think Congress has, without necessity, abnegated its power to a coterie of men who are not entitled to that distinction. [Applause.] I can say this for two reasons. First, I shall not be a Member of the next Congress; and, second, I think I can express the thoughts of a great many of the majority who might feel embarrassed in expressing their views themselves. It will not work. Take, for instance, the distinguished Committee on Military Affairs, some of the members of which have served long in Congress and have made a profound study of the subjects of which that committee has jurisdiction. With the jurisdiction to make appropriations for the War Department transferred to the Committee on Appropriations, the military bill is referred to a subcommittee composed of five. Assume, if you please, that two members on that subcommittee, or even three, are members of the old Committee on Military Affairs, yet at least two are new to the legislation involved. The subcommittee enter upon the consideration of the estimates or budget and finally bring in the bill. We may credit them with diligence and capacity in the discharge of their duties. They report it to the full Committee on Appropriations. The full committee meets some morning at 10 o'clock or 10:30 o'clock and hear from the chairman of the subcommittee some of the leading outstanding facts connected with the appropriation bill. They then have a little table discussion, and then some one moves to authorize the chairman to report the bill to the House. The full Committee on Appropriations, with the possible exception of the chairman and perhaps a few other diligent members, know nothing more about the military appropriation bill than the average intelligent, diligent Member of the House. The result is that the subcommittees frame these appropriation bills, and the query naturally arises, Who is best equipped to formulate these appropriation bills, a subcommittee of five of the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Military Affairs or any other of the committees formerly having jurisdiction of these various subjects, most of whom have given many years of study to the questions involved in the maintenance of the various establishments? I have no doubt in the world that Members in the Sixty-seventh Congress will decline longer to surrender their functions both as Members of the House and as members of these important committees to a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. It is not in the interest of wise legislation. We ought to return to the old plan, and there is no substantial reason why they should not return. A single committee making all appropriations is not an essential of a budget system. I know that theoretical writers have said so, but I am expressing this opinion from the standpoint of a Member of the House who has endeavored to observe legislation here and who believes that the best legislation in the way of appropriation bills for these several activities of the Government can be prepared by committees who have given many years of study to the problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more, that time not to be taken out of the time already agreed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more, and that the time for debate be extended for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Just to supplement this last thought, it is not necessary to a budget system. I am sure that every Member of this House and every student of the subject will agree that we have acted wisely in having passed a budget bill, which unfortunately and for perhaps a good reason was vetoed, but which I hope will pass in the next Congress or even at this session and become a law. Every student of the subject believes in a budget system, but that budget law, or whatever law may be passed, will be entirely workable and be consistent without one single appropriating committee. Let the appropriations for the activities of the Government be made as they have been made in the past by these separate committees who are prepared and equipped to serve Congress and to serve the country more acceptably than under the present plan. [Applause.]

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything at this time upon this proposition. I was waiting for a later paragraph, but inasmuch as the subject has been opened by our distinguished leader, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to a situation that presents itself particularly upon the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill. The argument is presented by those in office that there must be a certain amount of elasticity. There are in this bill two or three items that constitute a cesspool of unauthorized expenditures. Last year I had the opportunity to investigate some of those things myself. This year I was distinctly given to understand that it was not any of my business. Last year in the committee I fought an appropriation for \$700,000 for the President of the United States to spend as he saw fit. There were members of the committee who wanted to give him \$1,000,000. Every single man on that committee, I think, if the records had been kept, would be shown to be in favor of giving him the full \$700,000 save myself. I wanted to make it \$200,000, and we compromised after three days of endeavor on \$400,000, and I say to you that the Department of State was not handicapped one bit by being compelled to work on \$400,000.

The chairman of this subcommittee was last year a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a worthy and competent member. He now brings in a report for \$200,000. I want to cut that down. The distinguished leader says, of course, any man reserves the right to offer an amendment that will reduce an appropriation. I have not been here very long, but I have learned that it is just like pulling a molar tooth to do so, because the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] himself, if the situation gets to be critical, will jump on the floor and appeal to all our loyal and patriotic principles, to the Republican Party, to stand by the committee, and I am one of the fellows who stand with him when he does that.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. In a minute. Then the only thing left to do is to make the point of order, and after we make the point of order we get publicly spanked. I do not mind that, because I have been spanked so many times. However, I do not want the public to think any such thing as the leader said, that this is a part of the budget. This is simply one of the blunders of the so-called reform of the budget scheme [applause], and if those who proposed it have not the stamina and courage to undo their mistakes, I say to you that we will be in a worse plight.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. The remarks I made have no reference to a point of order that is made for the purpose of getting an item out that a Member thinks should not be in a bill or an indirect way of preventing an increase of an item or possibly eventually securing a decrease. What I had in mind was the making of a point of order against an item to which there was no special objection, simply because it was subject to a point of order. One is a legitimate legislative effect to accomplish what the Member believes ought to be done.

Mr. BEGG. I can not yield any more because my five minutes will be over in a minute. The gentleman's explanation is entirely satisfactory to me. I simply want to call the attention of this House or this committee to the fact that the laws that have been carried in the statute annually, not statute law but temporary law, have been rewritten, reworded, and resalaried without any further investigation than three men have given to them and we have to come in here and O. K. everything. Now I maintain that the people who sent me to Congress did not send me down here to be a poll parrot [applause], and I maintain they want me to investigate the expenditures of my Government just as much as they want me to take the word of the gentleman from Massachusetts, whose word I never doubt; I do not always agree with his judgment, but I do not believe this scheme is conducive to good Government in a democracy. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman is a member of the majority party and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Can he state what that committee has done toward bringing in an authorization—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time for debate be extended two minutes and that he be given those two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BEGG. Now, will the gentleman from Texas repeat the question?

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and a member of the majority party. Can he state any reason why that committee does not bring in a bill making an authorization for necessary expenses in order that—

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman from Texas, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, knows as well as I know that we have not time to do that, and I am not condemning entirely what has been done, but I do think that men who want to take the responsibility of making points of order on legal grounds under this rule should not be censured nor criticized nor publicly spanked, and as far as I personally am concerned I expect to make a point of order or two if my kind friend from Texas does not do it for me.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. But I do not think a man necessarily is gaining anything by wrecking the whole bill and ripping it wide open because—I will yield to the gentleman in a minute—it will come back to us. I know that, and the final result will be that instead of the House legislating it is going to be the other side of the Capitol passing an appropriation bill for us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSPORTATION OF DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS IN GOING TO AND RETURNING FROM THEIR POSTS.

To pay the itemized and verified statements of the actual and necessary expenses of transportation and subsistence, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, of diplomatic and consular officers and clerks in embassies, legations, and consulates and their families and effects in going to and returning from their posts, or when traveling under orders of the Secretary of State, but not including any expense incurred in connection with leaves of absence, \$300,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph because of the inclusion of the following matter, which constitutes new legislation on an appropriation bill without any authority of law therefor, namely, in line 20 the word "subsistence"; in line 23 the words "and their families and effects," and to that part of the amount of the appropriation to cover these unauthorized items where the committee has increased the normal appropriation from \$50,000 to \$300,000.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, this item in identically its present form has been carried in prior appropriation bills, but I make no point of that. The amount is not a statutory amount, and, as a matter of fact, the size of the item for the last fiscal year was \$270,000. The recommendation asks for an increase to \$300,000, because a change of administration always involves a very considerable increase in the amount of travel.

Mr. BLANTON. And prior to last year it was only \$50,000?

Mr. ROGERS. No; that is not true.

Mr. BLANTON. Look in 1917; what was it then?

Mr. ROGERS. In 1915 and 1916 it was \$50,000.

Mr. BLANTON. And how much in 1917?

Mr. ROGERS. Nineteen hundred and seventeen, \$52,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Fifty thousand dollars, was it not?

Mr. ROGERS. Fifty-two thousand dollars. In 1918 it was \$125,000; in 1919 it was \$145,000; in 1920 it was \$270,000.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

Mr. BEE. Do I understand the increase is due to the fact that so many Democrats will be going home after the 4th of March next?

Mr. ROGERS. That is partly the reason.

Mr. BEE. I hope the gentleman from Texas will not object to Democrats having their way paid back home.

Mr. BLANTON. Democrats and Republicans all look alike to the gentleman from Texas when it comes to taking money improperly out of the Treasury.

Mr. ROGERS. Dealing with the actual question presented by the point of order, it is contemplated in the law that our officials in the Diplomatic and Consular Service shall be moved from post to post. As the chairman very well knows our appointments to the Diplomatic and Consular Service are not to a specific post, but as members of a specific class. The Secretary of State has authority, and frequently exercises that authority, to move our diplomatic and consular officers from station to station all over the world. But any increase in class or salary involves a new confirmation by the Senate. An earlier item in this very bill makes provision for the payment of salaries of diplomatic and consular officers while in transit to and from their posts.

In other words the payment of the travel expense account of members of the Diplomatic and Consular Service seems to me to be one of the necessary incidents of the proper maintenance of the service. I therefore contend the item is in order under prior decisions of the Chair on this bill and on other recent appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MANN of Illinois). May the Chair ask either of the gentlemen if there is any provision of law limiting what subsequent payments may be made by the Government?

Mr. ROGERS. I am not aware of any such limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

STEAM LAUNCH FOR EMBASSY AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

The unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$1,800 for hiring of steam launch for use of embassy at Constantinople made in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921 is reappropriated and made available for the same purpose for the official use of the legation at Constantinople for the fiscal year 1922.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph that there is no law authorizing it.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I make the point of order that there is no law authorizing the appropriation or reappropriation of \$1,800 for a steam launch at Constantinople. That was merely an unauthorized provision carried in the appropriation bill of last year. There is no authority of law for it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I freely admit that there is no substantive statute upon which this item is based. It has been carried for many years—since 1892, I believe—but I make no point of that. My contention on this item, as on the preceding item and on the contingent-expense item, is that this is a natural and proper instrumentality for carrying on the service of the United States at a particular post. In the case of Constantinople, the summer quarters of the embassy are some distance out in the country.

The climate of that city is such that all the diplomatic representatives of other countries as well as of our own country simply have to get away from the heat and transact their business in the summer at what is called the summer capital of Therapia. The journey to Therapia is necessarily by water. This item would have been in order if carried in the contingent-fund paragraph, and it bears a very close resemblance and analogy to the items which are specifically set forth and held permissible under the contingent fund. I submit to the Chair that there should be no less authority for carrying the item, because we carry it separately, so that the committee may see at once the precise purpose which is contemplated in connection with the use of this \$1,800.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that is an incident connected with the embassy quite within the power of Congress to appropriate for without specific authorization, the same as for the purchase of pens and ink, or anything else necessary for the conduct of the embassy. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I just wanted to suggest to the Chair the line of argument that has been made from time to time with respect to unauthorized provisions for automobiles. Would not an automobile and a steam launch stand almost on the same footing?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a question that is not before the Chair at this time.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to detain the committee, but my understanding of this item is that it is one that has been carried for many, many years; that the conditions at Constantinople are such that a steam yacht, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] has stated, is absolutely essential to the transaction of the business. We do not pay these men enough, anyway, and therefore a rich man has to be appointed to the office, and this is merely a reduction of the

expense that would fall upon the minister from this country to Turkey unless such provision is made. Because in going back and forth to his duties in the peculiar situation prevailing there it is essential that this steam yacht be used. And I hope there will be no objection to the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCIES ARISING IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE.

To enable the President to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, and to extend the commercial and other interests of the United States, and to meet the necessary expenses attendant upon the execution of the neutrality act, to be expended pursuant to the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes, \$200,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation made for this object for the fiscal year 1921, which is hereby reappropriated and made available for this purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out "together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation made for this object for the fiscal year 1921."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNALLY: Page 9, line 9, strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the practice of carrying items in appropriation bills reappropriating unexpended balances is a very reprehensible and unwise practice. It does not convey to the membership of the House the real facts as to how much money a bill is appropriating, and it makes possible a showing of apparent savings which are not, in fact, true. Now, the gentlemen on the majority side of the House have adopted a practice of reappropriating unexpended balances and not carrying those items forward into their footings, and they go before the country with a great blare of trumpets professing to be really retrenching appropriations when, as a matter of fact, in many instances that is not the case.

Now, as to this particular item, I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that prior to the war, in 1914, this sum was only \$50,000 for the President's emergency fund. In 1916 it was only \$75,000. Of course, during the existence of the war it was necessary to greatly increase this item, because the President was required in carrying on the diplomatic affairs of the Government during those troublous times to send a great many representatives to most of the countries of Europe. But that necessity is now passed, and there is no reason for appropriating a large sum to the President for what is known as the secret fund. Now, it is true that the incoming President perhaps will need more than the \$50,000 or more than \$75,000 appropriated before the war for financing an international scheme or plan which he may have in mind for bringing about an association of nations. And that is one reason I have not offered an amendment to cut it down to \$75,000, as it was before the war.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield.

Mr. BEGG. Has not the gentleman somewhat changed his position from that of a year ago, when he was in favor of making it \$700,000?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that I do not recall for what amount I voted in the committee a year ago, but I will say to the gentleman that a year ago the condition of the world's foreign affairs and the foreign affairs of this Nation were in quite a different state from what they are to-day.

At that time this Nation was still negotiating with the other nations of the world for the purpose of bringing about some international agreement in behalf of peace and the settlement of international disputes by some tribunal, and it was necessary to have a fund of this kind in a large proportion, because the war, in addition to that, had left a great many diplomatic questions unsettled. My chief objection is to the habit this House has adopted of appropriating unexpended balances, when nobody on the floor, save perhaps the chairman of the committee, knows how much money is in the unexpended balance. For that reason I believe that \$200,000 will be ample during the coming year in the hands of the new President in carrying on any negotiations that he may see fit to pursue in bringing about an association of nations, which he has announced to the world is his purpose during the early days of his tenure of office. Two hundred thousand dollars, gentlemen of the committee, is sufficient for this item.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment, and I earnestly hope it will be defeated.

I do not sympathize, on general principles, with the practice of carrying unexpended balances; but during the eight years

I have been on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has been on the committee the same length of time—

Mr. CONNALLY. Four years.

Mr. ROGERS. This particular unexpended balance of appropriation has been carried without exception year after year. The amount of the unexpended balance that will be available on June 30 next is problematical, because you can not predict what emergencies will arise in the Diplomatic and Consular Service between now and the 30th day of June.

Let me suggest the sort of items that this appropriation is intended to care for. There have, within the last few weeks, come reports from many of the important emigration centers of Europe that wholesale passport frauds are being perpetrated by organized gangs of men who seek to counterfeit passports and our visés and our stamps, and so on, in order to enable immigrants who would not otherwise be permitted to come to the United States to get, by fraud, the apparent sanction of law.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Just in one moment. In order to ferret out those frauds and suppress them, as the welfare of this country certainly requires, it is necessary for the department to have a fund on which it can call in order to send forth agents, investigators—detectives, if you like—to go into cases of that kind and try to put a stop to the practice.

That is the sort of thing that is dealt with in this item. There are many others. But it strikes me that it is not at all wise to reduce the item below the figure which the committee recommends.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was not quite accurate in his statement as to the amount which has been available in this particular fund in recent years. Going back to 1912 there was \$90,000 appropriated; in 1913, \$97,000; in 1914 it got down to \$75,000; and in 1915 it was placed at \$125,000; in 1916, at \$211,000; in 1917, \$310,000; in 1918, \$230,000; in 1919, \$722,000; in 1920, \$300,000; and for the current year, \$400,000. The Department of State asked for \$400,000 for the ensuing fiscal year. We thought they ought not to have that amount of money. At the same time we recognized that the problems which grew out of the administration of the fund have not ended, even though the war has ended, and that we ought to give a sufficient amount to protect the country in these important matters, which can not be segregated or specifically described or even foreseen in an appropriation bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is in charge of this bill, admit that he does not know how much the unexpended balance is?

Mr. ROGERS. No one can tell what the unexpended balance will be next June 30.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the gentleman any idea?

Mr. ROGERS. I have an idea that it may be from \$50,000 to \$75,000. But the emergencies have not yet arisen for which we may have occasion to utilize this item.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that the gentleman, who has prepared this bill, largely himself, brings in here a bill without knowing how much it appropriates.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman, I know, does not mean to be unfair. How can an unexpended balance for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, be stated, or rather prophesied, with confidence in January, 1921?

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the gentleman know what the present unexpended balance is?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. The approximate present unexpended balance I can give the gentleman. There was between \$300,000 and \$400,000 unexpended on January 1. There was available on July 1 \$644,000, and \$264,000 has been expended since that time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why does not the gentleman strike out the unexpended balance, and simply make an appropriation of a sum sufficient for this service, without keeping the House and the country in the dark as to how much we are appropriating in this bill?

Mr. ROGERS. I think there is no objection to that. There is much to be said in its favor. But the Committee on Appropriations this year has simply been following the practice which the gentleman from Texas has subscribed to, apparently, during a period of several years.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would say to the gentleman that that is not exactly a fair statement of the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, there are only about 50 Members present. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and on that motion I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the committee do now rise, and on that motion he demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. ROGERS and Mr. McCLINTIC to act as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 3, noes 98.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TOWNER). On this vote the ayes are 3 and the noes are 98. A quorum is present. The motion to rise is lost. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the House that I think there is no question but that this item is subject to a point of order. But I think there are good reasons why there should be an emergency fund of a certain amount, and hence I have refrained from making a point of order against it. But I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this item of \$200,000, instead of \$75,000 or \$90,000 or \$100,000, is being appropriated on the sole evidence of the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Davis, who said, "No, sir" to a question by the gentleman from Massachusetts when he said, "Of course you could not get along with any less?" Mr. Davis said "No, sir," and of course then they gave him the whole amount. I call the attention of the House to the fact that last year the Department of State said they could not function without \$700,000. Finally, because there was a weapon of a point of order that could be used, they received \$400,000, and they did function, and the distinguished chairman of this committee, Mr. ROGERS, says that they are liable to have from \$75,000 to \$100,000 left. Now, I am only offering this amendment to see if it is possible to get an item reduced when the chairman of the committee wants to have it put in, when there is not a single word of evidence in the testimony to justify it.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will be glad to let the gentleman have an opportunity to reply in his own time.

Mr. ROGERS. Just on a question of fact. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the committee recommended in the bill what the department asked?

Mr. BEGG. No; I did not say that.

Mr. ROGERS. Because we cut it from \$400,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. BEGG. I did not mean to say you had given them all they asked. In reply to your question they said they could not get along without \$400,000, and you arbitrarily gave them \$200,000. Last year they said they required \$700,000, and they received \$400,000, and they got along and will have \$100,000 left. Now, what are the emergencies that will arise? Why, no man in this House knows, and I claim it is a temptation for corruption; if it is not actually so and has not been in the past there is a great likelihood of it being developed when \$200,000, \$300,000, or \$400,000 can be spent for which the Members of Congress can not see the vouchers. I say to you that as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I asked to see the vouchers and was denied. I do not intend to vote for appropriations that nobody knows anything about.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will not yield. I know that a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee was appointed, consisting of three members, and I know they went down there, and I know they can not tell where the money went. They saw only a part of it, and if this country knows that we are appropriating sums of money like this in time of peace they will not approve it. I would not oppose a proposition of this kind in time of war. I would give them \$1,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000 if they needed it, but in time of peace there are no emergencies arising that can not be handled by this body calling for the expenditure of \$200,000 if you are playing fair with the people and with the other countries.

Now, the fact is that Secretary of State Lansing halfway admitted that they used this money to send secret agents over to Europe during the very time that President Wilson was advocating and trying to put across the proposition of open covenants openly arrived at. During that very time he wanted a special fund of \$700,000. I know that Mr. Harding does not want any great sum of money for emergencies. He has been in Congress, and he knows that if an emergency threatens this country he

can get all the money he wants, and get it without any delay. As far as being swamped with passports is concerned, that is mere talk to get this fund increased; and I want to say to the gentleman that if the next appropriation bill brings in an item like this I will make a point of order against it. I did not do it this time. I had the right and unquestionably could have made it stick, but I did not do it; but I want to see if it is possible to reduce an appropriation that three men asked for on no testimony whatever except the statement of a man in official life. There is not a line of reason, and I defy any man in this body to go to the State Department and justify the expenditure of even \$100,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] admitted that he had been spanked from the floor of the House by his majority leader. Under such whip and spur I am afraid his little protesting flurry that he has made here is going to put him in the position of being guilty of lese majeste. However, I am not in his situation. I am a kind of a free lance, and I am not afraid of being so scolded.

The gentleman said that the purpose of his amendment was to see if there was a chance ever in this House to cut down a committee appropriation. I want to tell him that there is not by vote. I have tried it before. There is only one way to cut, and that is by point of order. Now, if it were to put something in the bill, there would be ample opportunity for him to be successful. If he sought to enlarge it or to put a new item in it he would have a fine chance of success; because he will remember that in the last bill under consideration, the Agriculture appropriation bill, there was an item of \$360,000 for garden seeds put back in the bill after we had voted it out by a vote of the House. After sleeping on it overnight and trading around among the Members, after they had made trades, \$360,000 garden seeds for \$1,000,000 mountain tops, they came in the next morning and defeated the proposition to save that money and voted it back into the bill, and the fellows who got their garden seeds turned around with the mountain-top fellows and voted \$1,000,000 for mountain tops back into the bill, which had theretofore been knocked out on my point of order. But I will tell you, I know how the gentleman from Ohio feels. He feels like he is not getting anywhere in trying to save the money for the people, because, whether the committee of five Members that framed the bill are right or wrong, their judgment being based upon just such flimsy testimony as the gentleman has shown here for this item, it is impossible for the other 430 Members of Congress to change the decision of the committee. Not that the committee know any more about it than we do, because they do not, but just because it is the action of the committee you have got to stand by the committee, and that is the way the people's money goes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, so long as Congress continues to do business and to do so intelligently, the House and the Committee of the Whole must necessarily rely to a large extent upon the judgment of the gentlemen on both sides of the House having the bill in charge who are members of the committee reporting the bill. Therefore I find no fault with the majority side of the House on that account as I did not when the majority was on the other side of the Chamber for relying on their committees in the absence of some direct information which would lead them to do otherwise.

But I do want to add just a word with reference to the method of appropriating money that is now employed by the House, as compared to that in former days. The gentleman from North Carolina has very aptly said that the mere fact of concentrating appropriations in one committee is no part of a budget system, and in my opinion it is not a necessary part of any plan for economy. There is a plan which I presume practically every Member of the House has given more or less consideration to, therefore I call attention to it, not because it is something new but because I believe it will properly and effectively limit and hold down appropriations. Let us have a real budget committee, with authority to limit the amount any committee may appropriate in any appropriation bill, and that will be a step toward real economy, which while actually limiting appropriations will not limit or curtail the rights and privileges of individual Members.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose the committee is allotted \$10,000,000 and brings in a bill amounting to \$10,000,000, could the Members on the floor add to it?

Mr. CARTER. The Members on the floor can add to it by cutting off other amounts that they think is unnecessary in the bill. But it would make any amount over and above the amount limited by this budget committee subject to a point of order, the same as if it was not authorized by law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose the amendment should be adopted; then in that legislative bill some item would have to be knocked out.

Mr. CARTER. I was discussing appropriation bills and not the legislative bills.

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose the committee allotted \$10,000,000 and brings in a bill with a total amount of \$10,000,000—

Mr. CARTER. It would not necessarily have to do that. If it was doing its duty, the committee would not necessarily come in with the maximum allowed.

Mr. CONNALLY. They generally exceed the maximum.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is mistaken about that. Committees have not exceeded maximums in the past for the reason that there has been no limitation whatever. The committees have done fairly well in the past and are doing fairly well now. But what I want to emphasize is that the bills are passed upon by only five men or less, whereas under the past system they had consideration by committees of 21 members. When they come to the Appropriations Committee the bill is now referred to a subcommittee of five. Very often, I am sure, the bill is considered without a majority of the five being in the committee room, and some of them without past experience concerning matters under consideration. So that where in the past we had consideration by 21 men, who at least were supposed to have studied the question and be somewhat expert, you now have consideration by five, or less than five, some of them never having dealt with the items before. So the question that naturally arises is, are five men, some without previous experience, more competent to pass upon these items and recommend them to the House than 21 experienced men; and if so, why not 10 men more competent to run Congress than 435 men?

Mr. ANDERSON. Has it not been the practice under the old system of different committees to refer an appropriation bill to a subcommittee of five?

Mr. CARTER. In some committees it has and some it has not. Some committees have considered these bills by the whole committee only without reference to subcommittees, while others have first utilized the subcommittees, and still others have referred the bills to subcommittees, giving all members of the committees the privilege of serving on the subcommittee, but whatever method may have prevailed with reference to that the bill was always given careful detail consideration by the entire committee of 21 members before presented to the House. The present procedure, as I understand, is that the bill is reported by the subcommittee, an explanation made by the chairman of the subcommittee, whereupon the bill is reported by the Committee on Appropriations without even reading the bill. So it must be conceded that there is no real consideration by the real Appropriations Committee consisting of 35 members, such as was given these matters by former committees of 21 members.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BEGG) there were 11 ayes and 17 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALLOWANCE TO WIDOWS OR HEIRS OF DIPLOMATIC OR CONSULAR OFFICERS WHO DIED ABROAD.

Payment under the provisions of section 1749 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to the widows or heirs at law of diplomatic or consular officers of the United States dying in foreign countries in the discharge of their duties, \$2,500.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of making some observations with reference to the functioning of the great Appropriations Committee of the House, a section of which is presenting this bill to the House. I do this in no partisan spirit. I do not criticize the good purpose of the Appropriations Committee, nor do I question the ability of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], who so ably, from every standpoint, is submitting this bill to the judgment of the House.

But the fact is that this bill has not been reported to the House by the Appropriations Committee upon the responsibility of the judgment of the several members of that committee, based upon detailed, mature consideration of its provisions by the membership of that committee. I question no one's motives nor the earnestness of effort on the part of the Appropriations Committee, but I do challenge the wisdom of the plan and assert the unworkableness of the plan. It is not humanly possible for the members of the Appropriations Committee to go into the details of these appropriation bills.

This plan, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SMALL] has just observed, is not necessary to the operation of the principle of the budget plan. This Appropriations Committee is composed of a larger number than any other committee heretofore exercising jurisdiction over matters of appropriations has ever had, but instead of the present plan of increasing the number of those who inquire into the details of legislative need for the expenditure of public money we have decreased their number.

It is perfectly evident that the members of the general Appropriations Committee can not acquire sufficient personal knowledge as to the details of the needs of all the various departments of the Government to have an independent judgment as to whether or not the particular items of appropriation should be incorporated in the appropriation bills for these departments. Besides, Mr. Chairman, there is such an intimate relationship between the work of the departments, their general legislative needs, and their money requirements that they can not be dealt with by separate committees without duplication of committee work and, in a most definite degree, without duplication of legislative consideration. Whether a given thing should be undertaken so frequently depends upon what it will cost that the venture and the cost of the venture should be considered at the same time by a committee of specialists with regard to that department. And sometimes it is expedient for the Congress to consider them at the same time. I know this suggestion is in conflict with the general idea that legislation should not be on appropriation bills, but there is a definite advantage in preserving the legislative possibility of putting some incidental and emergency legislation upon appropriation bills, reserving, as now, to each Member of the House the right to strike it from the bill upon a point of order. But with the legislative committees and the Appropriations Committee in conflict as to jurisdiction that advantage will be lost.

Now, what has happened? We find here in charge of this bill two or three members of the general Appropriations Committee. As a matter of fact, there is in charge of this bill one member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], a former member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the committee which formerly had jurisdiction over both the general legislation and over appropriations dealing with the Consular and Diplomatic Service. The same situation obtained with reference to the Agricultural appropriation bill recently passed by the House. In that case the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], formerly a member of the Agricultural Committee, was in charge.

It is perfectly evident that the Appropriations Committee, in order to function at all, has been compelled to draft Members who acquired the necessary knowledge while they served on these other committees of the House. What will be the situation when this knowledge which they acquired while serving on these other committees shall have become antiquated?

Not only is this bill not in charge of the Appropriations Committee as such, but there is nothing to justify the assumption that it has been reported to the House upon the responsibility of the independent judgment of the members of the Appropriations Committee, based upon detailed, independent knowledge of the several items in this appropriation bill.

I do not say this in criticism either of their purpose or ability. I am criticizing the plan. It is perfectly obvious that it is not humanly possible for these gentlemen, who constitute the general Appropriations Committee, to go into detailed inquiry with regard to the items in the bills which they report. The House must have committees and Members of the House must largely follow these committees and depend upon their knowledge acquired and upon their judgment. As between the two plans, it seems to me judgment should be based upon whether or not it is better to have an investigation conducted and a bill drawn by from three to five Members of the House or to have the investigation conducted by 21 Members of the House; whether it is better to have this little committee, which of necessity is in personal touch with from three to five constituencies in the Nation, possibly all from one section, or a committee in touch with 21 constituencies representing different sections; whether it is better that the committee which reports these appropriation

bills shall, each member of it, have full time and opportunity to familiarize himself with every detail of the legislation, or to have one committee reporting all the bills which, in the very nature of things, can not know as a committee whether or not the details which make up the appropriation items should or should not be incorporated in the bill.

When formerly this appropriation bill came from the Committee on Foreign Affairs it came from a committee that primarily had to do with only one department of the Government. It could specialize and did specialize, and because it could specialize and did specialize, and had full opportunity to know what it was recommending to the House, Members of the House, when they came to vote upon a proposition concerning which they could not themselves have detailed information, had the advantage of the judgment of 21 of their colleagues coming from every section of the country, who, at least, had had the opportunity to go into every phase of the matter touched by the proposed legislation.

The fact that the knowledge acquired by such a Member having to do only with one of the great departments of the Government, a Member who had a chance to specialize, has caused him to be placed in charge of this bill is highly persuasive.

A moment ago the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], in charge of the bill, yielded to the mild imputations of my colleague from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that he, the gentleman in charge of the bill, wrote it. I know of no better individual to write this bill than the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. I would follow his judgment as quickly as I would follow the judgment of any other gentleman in the House, but when a bill comes in here upon the floor of the House and I am asked to follow the judgment of the committee I want to know that the bill has been submitted to the collective judgment of a considerable group of gentlemen.

This plan has broken down because it is fundamentally impossible from the standpoint of the limitations upon what is humanly possible. There is no use trying to deceive ourselves about the matter. These bills which we are called upon to enact into law represent not the independent and, in detail, advised judgment of the committee which reports them but represents primarily the judgment of from three to five gentlemen of the House, and in the main represents, I believe, the judgment of that member of the Appropriations Committee given charge of the bill, who formerly served upon the committee which heretofore had committee jurisdiction over the legislative matters and many appropriations of the department being appropriated for. If one member formerly of that committee, by reason of his service on that Committee on Foreign Affairs, acquired knowledge which so permanently, as compared with his present committee colleagues, fitted him to draft and present this bill, why should the House not have the benefit of the judgment and the assistance of the other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the drafting and presentation of this appropriation bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. MADDEN rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I rise against the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, is it not the procedure of the committee that once the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has been recognized, he is entitled to the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. That is true. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of criticism of the rule under which the House is now operating with reference to a Committee on Appropriations composed of 35 members. I was a member of an appropriating committee until this rule was adopted, but I am not one of those who are now undertaking to impede legislation by driving tacks in the tires and pouring water into the carburetor. I believe this House ought to give this system of one appropriating committee a trial and a fair chance. I submit that up to this time it has not had a fair opportunity to demonstrate its usefulness. The complaint is made that bills coming from the Appropriations Committee under the present system—and I am not a member of that committee—are not well considered, that they are considered only by a subcommittee; but, gentlemen of the House, whether they are considered by the whole committee or not, the responsibility is upon the whole committee when it approves

the findings of the subcommittee and brings the bill before this House.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. I remember the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I can not forget that he is a member of the important Committee on Indian Affairs, and was lately the chairman of that committee. I do not blame the gentleman from Oklahoma for feeling somewhat displeased at the fact that his committee has been deprived of the appropriating power, but in that connection I want to submit this general observation: In this House, as it is constituted and under its rules, selection to places on committees generally is controlled by the predilections and desires of gentlemen who are selected for the committees. For instance, a gentleman who lives in the West, where the Government has considerable public lands to be disposed of, frequently wants to get on the Committee on Public Lands; a gentleman who lives in Oklahoma, where the Indians are located, wants to get on the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A gentleman is selected on the Committee on Naval Affairs because he has predilection for the Navy. What is the result? The result soon is that they become "bugs" on the particular matter with which their committee deals. The naval committee soon grows into the belief that the Navy is the most important arm of the Government, and that we ought to have the greatest Navy in the world. The Member who gets on the Committee on Military Affairs, where he associates with Chiefs of Staff and Secretaries of War, soon gets of the opinion that the Army is the outstanding branch of this Government. I believe that this system of one appropriating committee is entitled to a fair trial, because, after all, the membership of this House in the Committee of the Whole House, which is the chief forum at last, has absolute control over the Appropriations Committee and can strike from the bill or add to the bill items under the rules of this House.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman thinks that a responsibility distributed among 21 will make "bugs" of them, how much greater "bugs" will they become if you concentrate that responsibility in a subcommittee of five?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the gentleman that that question is rather artfully put, but it will not bear examination. The fact is that his Committee on Indian Affairs submitted the appropriation bill to a subcommittee of five, and three of that five had the right to control the decision of the subcommittee. The work of that subcommittee was then reported to the Committee on Indian Affairs of 21. Why is the analogy not just the same in respect to the Appropriations Committee submitting the bill to a subcommittee of five and it then being O. K'd not by 21 but by a membership of the Committee on Appropriations of 35?

Mr. CARTER. I would like to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said that the gentleman's question did not bear examination.

Mr. CARTER. But the gentleman is asking why.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I can not yield if I have only two minutes.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is not yielding out of the two minutes. I yielded to the gentleman every time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman wants to know the difference between a subcommittee of five on one of the old appropriating committees and a subcommittee of five on the new committee. It is just this: Under the old plan, as I explained a moment ago, the bill was brought in and every item was considered by the whole committee, whereas now the Committee on Appropriations does not consider any particular item in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the gentleman that that will not bear examination, because if the 35 members of the Committee on Appropriations who are under oath as Members of this body and who are under an obligation to perform a certain duty as members of the committee, fail to examine these bills, then that is simply a breach of duty on the part of the

Appropriations Committee and does not go to the merits of the system at all.

Mr. CARTER. It will not be humanly possible.

Mr. CONNALLY. It does not go to the merits of the system to speak of subcommittees. Under the old system, instead of the subcommittee deciding this matter, very frequently it was the chairman of the particular committee who dominated and controlled the committee and the appropriations from that committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this paragraph close in eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that all debate on this paragraph close in eight minutes.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced he was in doubt.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 38, noes 6.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers [Mr. ROGERS and Mr. McCLINTIC] reported that there were—ayes 3, noes 83.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum of the committee is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Fisher	Linthicum	Riordan
Aswell	Flood	Little	Robinson, N. C.
Bakka	Gallagher	Loneragan	Rosenberg
Bacharach	Gallivan	Lusk	Rose
Baer	Gandy	McCulloch	Rowan
Bell	Ganly	McFadden	Rube
Benson	Glynn	McGlennon	Rucker
Blackmon	Godwin, N. C.	McKenzie	Sabath
Bland, Ind.	Goldfogle	McKinley	Sanders, Ind.
Bland, Mo.	Good	McKinley	Sanders, N. Y.
Bowers	Goodall	McLane	Sanford
Brinson	Goodwin, Ark.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Schall
Britten	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Scully
Brumbaugh	Gould	MacGregor	Siegel
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Sims
Byrnes, S. C.	Greene, Vt.	Major	Sisson
Byrns, Tenn.	Griest	Mann, S. C.	Slemp
Caldwell	Griffin	Mead	Smith, Mich.
Campbell, Pa.	Hamill	Merritt	Smith, N. Y.
Candler	Hardy, Colo.	Milligan	Snell
Cantrill	Harrell	Montague	Snyder
Caraway	Harrison	Moon	Steele
Carew	Haugen	Mooney	Steenerson
Casey	Hayden	Moore, Ind.	Stephens, Miss.
Clark, Fla.	Hill	Mott	Stines
Classon	Hoe	Mudd	Sullivan
Cooper	Holland	Murphy	Sweet
Copley	Hulings	Neely	Tague
Costello	Hull, Tenn.	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Ark.
Crowther	Humphreys	Nicholls	Tincher
Cullen	Hutchinson	Nolan	Tinkham
Currie, Mich.	Jacoway	O'Connell	Treadway
Dempsey	James, Mich.	Olney	Upshaw
Dent	James, Va.	Parker	Vaile
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Patterson	Vare
Dominick	Johnson, Miss.	Pell	Voigt
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Perlman	Volk
Dooling	Kahn	Purnell	Ward
Drewry	Kelley, Mich.	Radcliffe	Whaley
Dupré	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, Ala.	Wilson, Ill.
Eagle	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, Henry T.	Wise
Edmonds	Kettner	Rainey, John W.	Wood, Ind.
Elliott	Kincheloe	Ramsey	Wright
Emerson	Kitchin	Ramsayer	Yates
Evans, Nev.	Kreider	Ransley	Young, Tex.
Ferris	Langley	Reed, W. Va.	
Fess	Lee, Ga.	Riddick	
Fish	Leshner		

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 15872, finding itself without a quorum, under the rules he directed the roll to be called. Thereupon 233 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he reported the list of absentees to be entered upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its session.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] made the statement that no responsible action on any of these appropriation bills was taken by the full Committee on Appropriations. He also said that the full committee to whom the subcommittee reports was not in possession of any information on the subjects reported to it, and in addition to that he said that the system has broken down. I deny each of those statements categorically. First, the Committee on Appropriations does as a whole act upon

its own responsibility on every bill that comes to this House from the committee. Second, every member of the Committee on Appropriations has knowledge of the facts contained in the reports made by the subcommittee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not yield now. I deny that the system has broken down.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I decline to yield at present. Of course we all realize, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the House is responsible for the final action on every appropriation bill. Nobody denies the right of any Member of the House to offer an amendment or to make points of order. The rules of the House are the same under the present system in respect to the question of legislation on appropriation bills as they were before the system was adopted. There has been no change whatever. I deny that except in a very few instances where it seemed to be essential to the administration of the fund to be appropriated that any legislation has been carried on any of these appropriation bills. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that these bills are in the language carried in most instances for years, and that there was no objection whatever to the language until it seemed to some Members of the House that one committee of the House had been given power more than they thought they should have.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield in a short time. There is not a member of the Committee on Appropriations, so far as I know, who wants to arrogate to himself any power except the power to function with which he is charged by reason of his appointment. Of course I realize, everybody realizes, that we have not entered upon a budget system complete. Everybody knows that we can not do that until the executive branch of the Government is charged with the responsibility of reporting a budget and, pending that, the Committee on Appropriations has done its best to carry out the will of the House. How well have they done it? On the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was passed a short time ago, we reported \$402,000,000 less than the estimates of the department. On the Army bill just reported, we come here with \$369,000,000 less—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did not we reduce the estimates more than that on each of the bills a year ago when the other system was working?

Mr. MADDEN. We reduced it because the estimates were larger then than now. To say that the committee is not functioning, that it takes no responsible action, is to state what is not the fact.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If it would not be an impertinent inquiry, I would like to ask the gentleman how much consideration to this particular bill did the whole Committee on Appropriations give?

Mr. MADDEN. This particular bill had the consideration for about two hours by the whole committee, and it, I want to say to the gentleman, struck several items from the bill as it was reported by the subcommittee. Now, I decline to yield further. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman from Illinois knows that I am in sympathy with this plan?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman from Illinois is a member of the Appropriations Committee of 35, and also a member of the majority steering committee. Will the gentleman give the House any assurance that the various legislative committees are now preparing authorizations for submission to the next Congress, and if they intend to do anything along that line, so that we will not have this unnecessary delay?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. I can only say in respect to the inquiry that in the consideration of the appropriation bill for the Post Office Department by the subcommittee on which I served we developed a great deal of what we thought was necessary legislation that should be enacted. When we completed the preparation of the appropriation bill we prepared a bill which embodied the legislation. We sent that to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. That committee took part of that legislation and put it into a bill of their own and added other legislation to

it, and the bill is now on the Calendar of the House. If every one of these other legislative committees would do the same thing there would be no reason for any complaint. There is no reason now for any complaint. There never has been a time in the history of this House when such progress has been made on appropriation bills. There never has been a session in the history of my long experience here when we have made as rapid progress. There never has been a time when we have been going to the extent to economize that we have recently, and there never was a time when economy was more needed than now.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I decline to yield just now. I have a few things I desire to say.

We hope in a day or two to report the naval bill, and we hope to be able to say to the House that we have saved \$300,000,000 over the estimates. We passed the legislative bill, and we have provided for 12,500 less places in the legislative bill than were estimated for.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to know whom the distinguished committee chairman is chastising?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman has no right to make a point of order like that.

This bill carries \$1,500,000 less than the bill of last year, and gentlemen have been opposed to every line in the bill. If we have no legislative authority for the language in the bill, there never has been legislative authority in the history of the Government for the appropriations sought to be made here, for we carry the exact language in most cases that has been carried for many, many years. It is true that much of this language was never legislated into law, and hence, technically speaking, it may be subject to a point of order, but every gentleman here must realize that the Government must function. Both parties, Democratic and Republican, nationally are pledged to the budget system, and the budget system is demanded by the American people. And the Congress of the United States will not speak the will of the American people unless they adhere to the budget system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSPORTING REMAINS OF DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS, CONSULAR ASSISTANTS, AND CLERKS TO THEIR HOMES FOR INTERMENT.

For defraying the expenses of transporting the remains of diplomatic and consular officers of the United States, including consular assistants, and clerks, who have died or may die abroad or in transit, while in the discharge of their official duties, to their former homes in this country for interment, and for the ordinary and necessary expenses of such interment, at their post or at home, \$5,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the following portion, which is unauthorized by law in legislation on an appropriation bill, to wit: In line 20, the words "and clerks," and in line 24, the words "and clerks," there being no authority of law for it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, as the point of order pertains to those items only, I am willing to concede it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

We have been engaged in the consideration of this bill for three days. In the past the bill has taken one day. In the last three hours we have read about four or five pages. Most of the three hours has been given up to a discussion of the merits and demerits of the budget system. I have not interposed a point of order to the effect that the discussion was proceeding out of order, because I knew that the matter was of interest to the gentlemen, and as the subject had been broached it seemed to be fair that the advocates and opponents should have liberal opportunity to discuss the question. But I think it is of consequence—and I think the House will agree that it is of consequence—that we make as much progress as we properly can with these appropriation bills. I believe we can without the slightest difficulty, if we adhere to the subject matter of the bill itself, complete the consideration of this bill and pass it this afternoon.

I do not wish to be discourteous to any gentleman. I do not wish to cut off fair discussion. But I desire to state at this time, and when, so far as I know, there is no gentleman that intends to discuss the budget system further, that I shall feel it my duty in the interest of expediting legislation to make a point of order on any further discussion which is not pertinent to the subject matter of the bill before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Contribution to the maintenance of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures, in conformity with the terms of the convention of May 20, 1875, the same to be paid, under the direction of the Secretary of State, to said bureau on its certificate of apportionment, \$2,895.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, in order to get some information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman in charge of the bill what authority of law there is for appropriating this \$2,895 every year that goes into this bill?

Mr. ROGERS. This is based upon a treaty obligation, and, as the gentleman well knows, treaty authority has the force of law.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, I know; but does the treaty call for this expenditure?

Mr. ROGERS. The treaty in question is the treaty of May 20, 1875. Article 9 of the treaty reads as follows:

The entire expense of the construction and outfit of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures, together with the annual cost of its maintenance and the expenses of the committee, shall be defrayed by contributions from the contracting States, the amount of which shall be computed in proportion to the actual population of each.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I knew it was a treaty provision. But the point I am getting at is this: Is this the computed part that we have to pay every year, and is it so used every year?

Mr. ROGERS. It has been utilized every year, so far as I am advised.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman thinks there is a necessity for still carrying it on?

Mr. ROGERS. As I conceive it, the good faith of the Nation is pledged until the treaty is denounced.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. It is computed that we owe this each year?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes; it is computed that we owe this each year. This organization is a going concern.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas withdraws the reservation.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking a brief question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman in charge of the bill tell us, very briefly, what they are doing with this money? I do not want to take up much time, but can the gentleman just indicate briefly what results are coming from it?

Mr. ROGERS. This international organization was created, as the item itself shows, as the result of a treaty proclaimed in 1875.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I know that. What are they doing with the money, and what are they getting for it?

Mr. ROGERS. The international bureau is maintained at Sevres, France. That international bureau is charged with the duty under the treaty of standardizing and distributing information concerning the weights and measures of the world.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. What are they doing with it? I have been going around here for a good many years, and I have not seen any results from it.

Mr. ROGERS. We pay \$2,895 for the maintenance of it, and that is our pro rata share. It standardizes weights and measures, as far as it can, and distributes information concerning them throughout the world.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What standards has it established? I am afraid I am displaying a good deal of ignorance, which other gentlemen would confess if they were frank. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROGERS. I will read for the benefit of the gentleman a statement of explanation which has been prepared by the Department of State.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; I will read it myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TARIFFS.

To meet the share of the United States in the annual expense for the year ending March 31, 1922, of sustaining the international bureau at Brussels for the translation and publication of customs tariffs, pursuant to the convention proclaimed December 17, 1890, \$8,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order in order to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to ask the chairman why it is necessary to raise this item from \$1,500, as it was in 1917, in normal conditions, to \$6,000?

Mr. ROGERS. The reason that was given was that the bureau, the office of which is at Brussels, found itself unable to perform the duties that were confided to it by the treaty at the old quota rate, and therefore, in accordance with the terms of the treaty, they quadrupled the contribution of the contributing members. The salaries have very greatly increased, as was quite natural, and rentals have gone up.

Mr. BLANTON. And all other parties to that treaty have had their share quadrupled?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes; all other parties to that treaty have had their share quadrupled.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.

To enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905, and 1906, between the United States and Mexico, including not to exceed \$600 for rent, \$5,000.

Mr. HICKS, Mr. HUDSPETH, and Mr. BARKLEY rose.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] is recognized.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of the bill a question.

I have looked through this bill and endeavored to ascertain if there is any proviso in here in any place by which we pay under this bill any part of the expense of the ice patrol in the North Atlantic Ocean. As the gentleman probably knows, we entered into an agreement with some of the more important maritime nations of the world some 10 or 12 years ago by which a patrol is maintained in the North Atlantic for protection from icebergs that come down from the Arctic Ocean. That work is now being done by the United States Coast Guard, and, I suppose, inasmuch as we do not make an appropriation in this bill, that the expense of that service must be maintained by the Coast Guard, and that the receipts come into the Treasury and the entire expense is outside of the purview of this bill?

Mr. ROGERS. I can answer the gentleman by saying that in the last eight years, at least, there has never been an item inserted or requested, so far as the Diplomatic and Consular bill is concerned.

Mr. HICKS. Therefore it must be assumed that the entire expense of that service comes from the appropriation for the Coast Guard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] if he desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do. It is to strike out, on page 10, line 23, "\$5,000" and insert "\$10,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDSPETH: Page 10, line 23, strike out "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000."

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I have not offered this amendment for the purpose of making a speech, but I take it that there is not a member of this committee that wants the Republic of Mexico to gain one foot of territory in the United States unless they get it legally. I had hoped to convince my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] of the necessity of this appropriation being at least \$10,000 in order that the Boundary Commission of the United States might continue to function. If you make the appropriation \$5,000, it absolutely destroys the work of the Boundary Commission of this Government. I do not believe you gentlemen want to do that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would like to know, as a matter of information, what function this Boundary Commission performs between Mexico and the United States?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I will tell the gentleman, if he will just bear with me a moment. The Rio Grande changes its course almost every year. It runs in many places through an alluvial valley, where it changes its channel by avulsion sometimes to the north, sometimes to the south.

Now, I will state to my friend from Kentucky that the boundary commission of Mexico is always on the job, and when this river changes its course that commission immediately makes its survey. Then if our commission is not there to make a sur-

vey and get the field notes which show where the change has taken place, it may be 8 or 10 years before we make a survey; if you destroy the Boundary Commission, it probably will be that long; and then if a question comes up as to where the boundary line between the United States and Mexico is the Mexicans, with the significant shrug of the shoulders so customary among themselves, would say, "You were not here when the survey was made, otherwise you would probably have agreed to the survey that we made," and then they would proceed to claim the territory of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much is involved in the changes of boundary in that river?

Mr. HUDSPETH. It might be hundreds of acres. I will say that one-third of the city of El Paso, my home, a city of 100,000 population, is involved to-day in what is known as the Chamizal Zone controversy with Mexico by reason of the change of the river.

Mr. MILLER. How many governments of Mexico are there participating in this service?

Mr. HUDSPETH. They have a boundary commission that officiates for whatever government there may be in operation there. I guess my friend knows that the governments of Mexico sometimes changes overnight.

Mr. MILLER. That is what I was asking about.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Men have gotten hoarse whooping it up for one government one day and awake to find that another government confronts them in the morning.

Mr. MILLER. Does each one of those governments make a survey?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Then they must have a new survey every day.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is not quite as bad as that; but they have acquired territory which properly belonged to the United States, by reason of the fact that the Mexican commission made the survey and our commission was not there to make its survey. Now, I say to you gentlemen, that my colleague [Mr. GARNER] and myself represent the border of Texas, between Texas and Mexico. He is familiar with the changes of this river, and I say to you gentlemen that I am talking to Americans now, not to Republicans or Democrats, and I do not believe there is a man on this floor who wants Mexico to get a foot of this soil that does not belong to her. It may be so poor that you can not raise an umbrella on it, but we are Americans, and we want that soil. We want the territory that belongs to the American Government to remain on this side. Now, many thousands of dollars might be lost if you destroyed this boundary commission.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand the gentleman from Texas to say that surveys have been made when our commission was not present?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What was our commission doing?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Our commission was not doing anything. It did not have enough money to do anything.

Mr. GARNER. I happened to be a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs when this matter was examined under Secretary Root and Secretary Knox and Secretary Bryan. If you will examine the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee, you will see that committee went into the matter very thoroughly as to the necessity for this Boundary Commission. Secretary Root asked for \$40,000 to conduct the affairs of the Boundary Commission. We interrogated him with reference to cutting down the appropriation or eliminating it entirely, and his reply was that if you eliminated the commission it would probably cost the Government \$100,000 each year to function and do the duties that are now incumbent upon the Boundary Commission. Secretary Knox reiterated that. Secretary Bryan did the same thing; and I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and to my colleague from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] that in my judgment \$10,000 will not be sufficient.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not think so either.

Mr. GARNER. I do not think it will be sufficient to perform the duties of this commission. What they have been doing with the small sum that has been appropriated is a very necessary thing, a thing that will probably redound to the great benefit of this Government when it comes to settle with Mexico, and that is they are measuring the water that is running down the Rio Grande. Half of that water belongs to the United States and half of it belongs to Mexico. We are taking a great deal of it, and I imagine that some of these days, when we come to arrange a treaty with Mexico, Mexico is going to say, "Oh, you owe us these millions of dollars for the use of our water."

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. On account of the changes in the course of this river, does this commission have just as much work to do now as it had in Secretary Root's time, when he advocated an appropriation of \$40,000?

Mr. GARNER. There is not a particle of difference. Now, the surveys that my colleague refers to come about in this way: The Rio Grande River rises once or twice a year. A flood will come down and cut off a hundred acres that was in Texas and put it in Mexico, and vice versa it will cut off 300 acres that was in Mexico and put it in Texas. Now, there is no jurisdiction over the enforcement of law unless there is some official commission that can determine whose property that is. Under the treaty if you cut off more than 640 acres it becomes the property of the other Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] has expired.

Mr. GARNER. I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague [Mr. HUDSPETH] be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his colleague's time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield? How many of these boundary commissioners are there?

Mr. GARNER. One.

Mr. LONGWORTH. At what salary?

Mr. GARNER. Five thousand dollars a year. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that Gen. Bliss was the boundary commissioner for a great number of years. After he left the office I am sorry to say that it came to be looked upon more as a political appointment than otherwise, and that has not been to my liking, if you will permit me to say so. But that this commission is necessary there is no doubt, and you will make a very great mistake, in my judgment, if you fail to provide for the proper functioning of this commission.

Mr. WALSH. Has this commission ever made any recommendation about establishing a fixed boundary line irrespective of the river?

Mr. GARNER. The boundary line is fixed in the treaty. The treaty was so drawn that when the boundary line changed by virtue of the change in the river, the commission must make the line.

Mr. WALSH. If they had recommended a boundary line that did not follow the course of the river—

Mr. GARNER. The boundary line is the center of the river, and when the river is here to-day, a week from to-day it is a mile and a half from that point. Who is going to tell whether this is the boundary or that is the boundary? Somebody must survey it and designate it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is it incumbent on the commissioners to travel the entire length of the boundary?

Mr. GARNER. Oh, they must travel at times up and down the river.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The reason I ask is that this seems to be a small appropriation.

Mr. GARNER. It is absolutely inefficient. It may be possible that the \$5,000 would be sufficient to measure the water. It is absolutely essential that the water should be measured. If we have a controversy with Mexico and we have not the information and they have, you can imagine where the commissioners will be left.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How long is the border?

Mr. GARNER. About 1,200 miles.

Mr. HICKS. How often does the commission report?

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is supposed to make an annual report. I am not going to quarrel with the gentlemen on the other side when they state the boundary commissioner is not doing anything. The engineer is the only man that is doing anything, so I am informed. We will have a chance to get a commissioner pretty soon who will do something, for you will make another appointment after the 4th of March.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who is the commissioner?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Louis D. Hill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Certainly.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is it not a fact that when the Democratic administration came in the first procedure was to cut down the appropriation for this commission and make the appointments as purely a political job?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not know; I was not here.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And they have never functioned since. The gentleman seeks relief because he thinks that the proper party is in possession of the Government and will do the right thing?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I ask that a sufficient appropriation be made to continue the commission in existence so that it will protect the property of the United States against any claim of Mexico. Last year the unexpended balance was \$20,522. This year you only appropriate \$5,000. No one, I think, who knows the gentleman, and knows what his work is and what he has done will question the fact that Mr. Corbin, consulting engineer, is an efficient man. He comes from Colorado from the district represented by Mr. HARDY.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is it not a fact that we had to pass a special bill the other day to pay two engineers who did the work on this commission because the appropriation was diverted by those in charge of it?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not recall.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is the fact.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am not defending the commissioner, but after the 4th of March we will have a change.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. We do not need it for political purposes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. No; we do not need it for political purposes, but to protect the rights of this Government against Mexico. Do you want the Mexican Government to have a commission on the ground and make a survey when the river changes and we have no commission there?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the Mexican Government has a commission on the job it will be a new thing.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Is it not true that the controversy referred to by the gentleman from Illinois arose out of a difficulty with a man named John Wesley Gaines, predecessor to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]? He was the man that caused the controversy and led to the political discussion.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Possibly so, but why destroy the commission on account of some political question?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. John Wesley Gaines was a Member of this House, and it was his popularity that kept the appropriation in the bill for a number of years.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to my friend that in 1857 the river ran right by the courthouse in El Paso. Afterwards it changed its course to the south at least a quarter or half a mile, and to-day one-third of the city of El Paso is involved in a controversy. If we had had a boundary commission on the ground at that time to make a survey that controversy probably would not have happened. I am talking horse sense to-day. I am not talking as a Democrat, but as an American. I do not care if this land was so steep that a billy goat could not climb it without spurs. It is American land and we want to retain it. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is the commissioner appointed for a stated period?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I think he is subject to removal, at the will of the President.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I think that, as conditions are to-day along the Mexican boundary, there is less practical justification for this item than for any other item in the bill. The only reason that the committee has recommended even \$5,000 this year is because there is a treaty obligation involved. We thought that the House and the Congress would not care to put it outside of the power of the Executive to keep alive the essentials of this organization to the extent required by the treaty.

This is no new viewpoint for the committee making up the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill or for the House of Representatives. In the bill reported last year by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] for the Diplomatic and Consular appropriations for 1921 this was the item:

To enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905, and 1906 between the United States and Mexico, \$5,000.

That item passed the House precisely as it was presented by the committee. I candidly admit that \$5,000 will not enable the commission to go very far, but it will enable the Executive to keep the commission alive so that if at a later date Mexico is able to take part in the boundary work, then we may get upon a really efficient footing again. As a matter of fact, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] to increase the amount from \$5,000 to \$10,000 would accomplish nothing whatever along the line that he himself is seeking to accomplish. It would simply mean that much more for salaries. The Department of State asked for \$50,000 this year. If the House thinks that Mexico and the United States can profitably engage in a boundary settlement during the next fiscal year, the House should accept the \$50,000 estimate. A \$10,000 item

will be of no avail whatever. It will do no more than the \$5,000 will do. We made inquiries from the representative of the Department of State when we had our hearings upon the bill; that representative spoke of the fact that the Congress and the Department of State had lost confidence in this commission, and admitted an inability to discuss the need for the \$50,000, which was carried in the estimates. We felt as a committee that we were doing exceedingly well by the great State of Texas and were fully recognizing the obligations growing out of the treaties in relation to boundary disputes to keep the commission alive by appropriating \$5,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman will not keep it alive by that amount. The consulting engineer draws \$4,800, and he does the work. I would say to the gentleman that my idea in offering this amendment increasing the amount from \$5,000 to \$10,000 was so that you could cut off the salary of the commissioner who does nothing and let the engineer make the survey and give him some expense money.

Mr. ROGERS. We are obligated by treaty to keep a force of water gaugers. The House thought last year, and I hope it will think this year, that \$5,000 is enough to care for the expenses of a few water gaugers.

Mr. GARNER. Then I take it the theory of the committee is that it does not intend to do otherwise than to keep a force of water gaugers there measuring the amount of water in the Rio Grande?

Mr. ROGERS. Our theory is to keep alive the commission only in so far as essential under the treaty.

Mr. GARNER. And you do not propose in 1922 to have any engineer who can survey a change in the river and give the information to your Government?

Mr. ROGERS. My theory is precisely the same as the theory of the House, as reflected in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill of a year ago, which carried \$5,000.

Mr. GARNER. I understand that.

Mr. ROGERS. Conditions have not since changed or improved so as to warrant a substantial increase at this time.

Mr. GARNER. But the unexpended balance was appropriated last year.

Mr. ROGERS. Not in the House. It was put on in the Senate, and perhaps it will be put on again. But the House took the position that \$5,000 was the proper amount, and the Committee on Appropriations this year simply sought to reflect the view of the House of a year ago.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that in my humble judgment the gentleman and the House are making a great mistake when they fail to appropriate sufficient money for this Government to get the data upon which we can at any time make a settlement with Mexico as to the division of lands between the two countries.

Mr. ROGERS. If the commission is worth anything, it is worth \$50,000; and if it is not we ought not to grant more than the \$5,000 necessitated by the treaty obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS) there were—ayes 45, noes 27.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight Members are present, a quorum. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOUNDARY LINE, ALASKA AND CANADA, AND THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

To enable the Secretary of State to mark the boundary and make the surveys incidental thereto between the Territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada, in conformity with the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and existing treaties, including employment at the seat of government of such surveyors, computers, draftsmen, and clerks as are necessary; and for the more effective demarcation and mapping, pursuant to the treaty of April 11, 1908, between the United States and Great Britain, of the land and water boundary line between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, as established under existing treaties, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, including the salaries of the commissioner and the necessary engineers, surveyors, draftsmen, computers, and clerks in the field and at the seat of government, expense of printing and necessary traveling, for payment for timber necessarily cut in determining the boundary line not to exceed \$500, and commutation to members of the field force while on field duty or actual expenses not exceeding \$5 per day each, to be expended in accordance with regulations from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of State, \$36,500, together with the unexpended balances of previous appropriations for these objects: *Provided*, That hereafter advances of money under the appropriation "Boundary Line, Alaska and Canada, and the United States and Canada," may be made

to the commissioner on the part of the United States and by his authority to chiefs of parties, who shall give bond under such rules and regulations and in such sum as the Secretary of State may direct, and accounts arising under advances shall be rendered through and by the commissioner on the part of the United States to the Treasury Department as under advances heretofore made to chiefs of parties: *Provided*, That when the commissioner is absent from Washington and from his regular place of residence on official business he shall be allowed actual and necessary expenses of subsistence not in excess of \$8 per day.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the following portion of the paragraph, beginning in line 11, page 12, and reading as follows:

Provided, That when the commissioner is absent from Washington and from his regular place of residence on official business he shall be allowed actual and necessary expenses of subsistence not in excess of \$8 per day.

I make the point of order because it is unauthorized by law, and it is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. What has the gentleman from Massachusetts to say to the point of order?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I supposed that to be a limitation in form and substance, and I think it is clearly in order.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that all of the law with respect to allowance for subsistence has always been \$5 a day? And I call the Chairman's attention to the preceding page where a similar provision is for \$5 per day while on field of duty.

Mr. ROGERS. What may have been prescribed on previous pages has no bearing on the law.

Mr. BLANTON. Subsistence has never been placed over \$5 a day in any law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Chair that this item is not subject to the point of order because the expenses of the commission, according to my understanding, are authorized by law. The object of this amendment was really to curtail expenses instead of increasing them. Heretofore this commissioner stayed at his home a great deal of the time, away from Washington, and he was in the habit, as I understand it, of charging up a per diem, and the committee limited this appropriation so that he could only charge those items when away from Washington on official business.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment concerning the regular place of residence was inserted upon the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], when this bill was before the House last year, and was held in order as a limitation.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is a limitation because it curtails expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks this is a limitation, and, as such, is within the Holman rule, and overrules the point of order. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not question the decision of the Chair, but just so it will not go without anybody giving attention to it I desire to say that there is a general law forbidding the payment of more than \$4 or \$5 a day for subsistence unless expressly authorized by the appropriation, passed only a few years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The effect of that law, the Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois, is a law which operates when there is no other provision made.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is a law which operates unless legislation changes it—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in view of that—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have no objection—

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a matter that is directed to the attention of the Chair a moment, and I would like to make a suggestion.

Mr. BANKHEAD and several Members. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes the decision is right in regard to this case, notwithstanding the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU AT BRUSSELS FOR REPRESSION OF THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE.

To meet the share of the United States in the expenses of the special bureau created by article 82 of the general act concluded at Brussels July 2, 1890, for the repression of the African slave trade and the restriction of the importation into and sale in a certain defined zone of the African Continent, of firearms, ammunition, and spirituous liquors, for the year 1922, \$125.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. BEE. I would like to ask for some information in regard to the repression of the African slave trade calling for an appro-

priation of \$125 and why \$125 is appropriated for the repression of the African slave trade? We had some difficulty over \$5,000 for the commission for the Rio Grande and here is an appropriation of \$125 to help the nations of the world keep down the African slave trade and in shipping munitions and liquor into Africa.

Mr. ROGERS. This is a treaty obligation dating from 1890. The bureau has one office at Zanzibar and one at Brussels. All the civilized countries of the globe cooperate in keeping the bureau alive and the organization in existence.

Mr. BEE. Well, are they still having an African slave trade in Africa?

Mr. ROGERS. There is still slave trading in Africa, I believe. The principal utility of the bureau to-day, however, is in connection with the regulation of the liquor traffic in Africa.

Mr. BEE. Well, it occurred to me that it was an item that either ought to cost something or cost nothing. What would \$125 do to keep down these African slave traders?

Mr. ROGERS. That is the amount prescribed by the treaty.

Mr. BEE. Did they all agree to give \$125 for that purpose?

Mr. ROGERS. The other nations give the same amount.

Mr. BEE. And, of course, we are carrying our share of the load?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL PRISON COMMISSION.

For subscription of the United States as an adhering member of the International Prison Commission, and the expenses of a commission, including preparation of reports, \$2,550.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph that it is unauthorized by law on an appropriation bill and is legislation unauthorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the Diplomatic and Consular act for the fiscal year 1913 contains the following paragraphs:

The United States shall continue as an adhering member of the International Prison Commission and participate in the work of said commission.

We have been appropriating since that time.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That is merely a provision on an appropriation act; it is not substantive law.

Mr. ROGERS. "The United States shall continue as an adhering member." I contend that is permanent law.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is not sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF ARBITRATION.

To meet the share of the United States in the expenses for the calendar year 1920 of the International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, created under article 22 of the convention concluded at The Hague, July 29, 1899, for the pacific settlement of international disputes, \$2,000.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, in the last diplomatic appropriation bill there was an appropriation for the Pan Pacific Union. That is a union which has been organized in the past few years for uniting for their common benefit the countries which border upon the Pacific, including, of course, the countries of the Orient. While the Department of State made no estimate for that organization in this bill, and while I am not insisting that an appropriation shall be made, yet I do wish to say a few words to call attention to what I conceive to be its intrinsic importance. The trade upon the Pacific in the near future will show signs of large increase. The time has arrived when very important pages in the history of the world will be written upon the Pacific. Our relations particularly with China, with Japan, the Philippine Islands, to which we are so closely united, our general commercial interests, the great importance to the people of the United States of increasing our trade, both imports and exports, the differences which exist to-day and which in the course of the future will arise from time to time between some of the important oriental countries and the United States, justify us in emphasizing the importance of binding together the people of this Republic to the people of the Orient. The Pan Pacific Union during the past few years has taken long strides in cementing the United States with the Central and South American Republics. The men who are behind the Pan Pacific Union are men of vision and faith. The Pan Pacific Union ought to be encouraged, and whenever the time shall come in the opinion of the Department of State and of the Congress that it should be assisted by appropriations from the Government of the United States those appropriations ought to be

willingly given. I have risen at this time simply to call the attention of the committee to the existence of the Pan Pacific Union and the good work which it is doing and to the importance of sustaining it both by public sentiment as well as by substantial contributions in the future. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION FOR PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

For the contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration at Brussels, Belgium, \$2,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I would like to ask the chairman in charge of the bill what is the use of carrying on this proposition when there are other means under contemplation for the end desired by this work?

Mr. ROGERS. This is an item about which I am not personally especially well informed.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I do not care to ask the gentleman. I make the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. The point of order is conceded, Mr. Chairman. The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

The judge of the said court and the district attorney shall, when the sessions of the court are held at other cities than Shanghai, receive in addition to their salaries their necessary actual expenses during such sessions, not to exceed \$8 per day each, and so much as may be necessary for said purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, is appropriated.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to that portion of the paragraph which provides for actual expenses during the sessions, not to exceed \$8 per day, for the reason that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, unauthorized by law. And I would like to call the Chairman's attention to the fact that our distinguished ex-colleague, Judge Adamson, who formerly was in this House, but who has now an office in New York, is still forced to live on the maximum for subsistence when away from his home and for traveling expenses to \$5 a day, and yet we can provide new legislation in this bill and in direct contravention of the law that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] cited the Chair to, which limits the amount for subsistence to \$5, and we can permit in this bill several instances for that subsistence to be raised in the appropriation bill to \$8. I do not think it ought to be permitted.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I think as the item is phrased it is probably legislation. I think if it was a limitation it would be in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is there not a statute in force allowing the United States judges not exceeding \$10 a day when away from home?

Mr. ROGERS. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think there is a statute directing United States judges not to expend to exceed \$10 a day when absent from their stations. If that is true, this is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not discussing the limitation.

Mr. BLANTON. The law limits the district attorney to \$5, and this is \$8.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. Just a moment, please. The point of order was directed only to the words "not to exceed \$8 per day each." As I understand, the ruling of the Chair allows the remainder of that paragraph to stand.

Mr. BLANTON. I only directed it to that one feature, of \$8 per day each.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARBITRATION OF OUTSTANDING PECUNIARY CLAIMS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN.

For the expenses of the arbitration of outstanding pecuniary claims between the United States and Great Britain, in accordance with the special agreement concluded for that purpose August 18, 1910, and the schedules of claims thereunder, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, and to be immediately available, as follows:

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to that part, in line 15, which says "and to be immediately available."

Mr. ROGERS. I concede the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What is the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. That it is unauthorized legislation on an appropriation bill; that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is just as much in order to make it immediately available as it is to appropriate it for another year, so far as the authorization by law is concerned.

Mr. BLANTON. It is new legislation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is not new legislation. It is an appropriation. Now, that point of order used to be made on this bill and would have been in order, because the Committee on Foreign Affairs when it reported this bill had no authority to report a deficiency appropriation. But the Committee on Appropriations has authority to report deficiency appropriations, and to the extent that it is made immediately available it is a deficiency appropriation. But the point of order can not be made that the Committee on Appropriations can not report this, because they have the authority to report appropriations.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. This particular subcommittee has nothing in the world to do with deficiencies.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This feature we are considering has nothing to do with the particular subcommittee. We deal with the Committee on Appropriations. Now, the old rule was—and it was held many times on the sundry civil bill, coming from the Committee on Appropriations—that you could make an item immediately available. Of course, all the deficiency items are made immediately available without anything further. But the Committee on Appropriations is not required to report all of its deficiency items in one bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is not sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of office for joint secretaries, \$480.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph, that it is new legislation on an appropriation bill and unauthorized by law.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, it is based upon a treaty and is in all respects in harmony with the provisions of that treaty.

Mr. BLANTON. Nowhere in the treaty does it provide for such officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is not sustained. The Clerk will read.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 14122. An act to authorize the sale of a portion of the Copper Harbor Range Lighthouse Reservation, Mich., to Houghton and Keweenaw Counties, Mich.

CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, United States agency: Agent, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, \$7,500 per annum; counsel, \$5,000 per annum; counsel and joint secretary, who shall also act as disbursing clerk, \$3,000 per annum; two counsel, at \$2,750 each per annum; one law clerk, \$2,240 per annum; two stenographers, at \$1,440 each per annum; and messenger, \$840 per annum; in all, \$26,960.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph, it being legislation on an appropriation bill without any authority of law for it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I repeat my comment on the first paragraph, to the effect that we have a treaty with Great Britain on this point, and that the organization here provided for is in accordance with the provisions of that treaty, and has been actually in existence for years.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is not sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SECTION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGH COMMISSION.

To defray the actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States Section of the Inter-American High Commission arising in such work and investigations as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$25,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph that it is new legislation on an appropriation bill, unauthorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the authority of law upon which this item is based is an act approved February 7, 1916, which provides for the appointment of delegates, to be known as the United States Section of the International High Commission. That same law provides that the delegates shall cooperate with the other sections of the commission in taking action upon the recommendations of the first Pan American financial conference. It is further provided that the President shall fill any vacancies which may occur in the said United States Section of

the International Commission. This is a substantive law and is not merely part of an appropriation act. It seems to me to be ample authority for the continuance of this commission.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Is there any provision in the act which the gentleman cited requiring the investigations to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and the money to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. The sum appropriated in this law was specified to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury. Last year the appropriation act provided that the actual expenditure should be under the direction of the Secretary of State, but that the investigations and the work should be under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask the gentleman from Massachusetts: As I understand the act that he refers to, it provided only for the payment for the year 1916. Under what authority does the gentleman claim that this would be in continuation of that act?

Mr. ROGERS. The first paragraph of the act to which I have referred is apparently unlimited in point of time. There may be some ground for the contention that the second paragraph is more temporary in its character, although there is a provision to the effect that the sum appropriated should remain available until expended. But, I say again, as far as the first paragraph is concerned, that there is no evidence whatever that this commission was to go out of existence at the end of that fiscal year or at the end of any other fiscal year.

Mr. BLANTON. The whole act is to be construed.

Mr. ROGERS. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the title of the act, which is "An act to provide for the maintenance of the United States Section of the International High Commission," which indicates a certain degree of permanency, at least.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not find any provision of the law making it a continuing provision. The title of an act has nothing to do with the provisions of the act, and it seems to the Chair that the provisions of this act apply only to a particular time. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WATERWAYS TREATY, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN: INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN.

For salaries and expenses, including salaries of commissioners and salaries of clerks and other employees appointed by the commissioners on the part of the United States, with the approval solely of the Secretary of State, expense of printing, cost of law books, books of reference, and periodicals, and necessary traveling expenses, and for one-half of all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the International Joint Commission incurred under the terms of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the use of boundary waters between the United States and Canada, and for other purposes, signed January 11, 1909, \$38,000, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for subsistence of the commission or secretary, except for actual and necessary expenses, not in excess of \$8 per day each, when absent from Washington and from his regular place of residence on official business.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph, because the amount provided for in lieu of subsistence is \$8, which is in excess of the amount which the statutory law of the country provides.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. The provision as it reads in the bill, without the limitation, authorizes the payment of all necessary expenses. Now, suppose that these commissioners should turn in an expense account amounting to \$10 a day. Would they be limited under the law to \$5?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Has the gentleman looked that up and ascertained it?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will remember that we had that very point up here when he made a point of order on the provision of the bill which sought to increase the amount for subsistence that would apply, for instance, to our colleague, Judge Adamson, who is filling a position in New York. My colleague then made a point of order, which was sustained by the Chair.

Mr. BLACK. I remember that point of order all right, but I was under the impression that if there was authority under general law authorizing necessary expenses, it would probably go higher than \$5.

Mr. BLANTON. No. The act referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] fixed the amount to be allowed in lieu of subsistence at not to exceed \$5.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If you put into this act an appropriation to pay actual and necessary expenses, they would be paid without any limit at all unless there is a limitation in the act.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair please, this provision was inserted here at my instance a year ago in order to limit the expenses under the paragraph. The Secretary of State, who has control of these expenses, might allow any sum for expenses. This is peculiarly a limitation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, my point of order went to the whole paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The point of order is not sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.

To pay the annual share of the United States, as an adhering member of the International Research Council and of the Associated Unions, organized at Brussels, July 18-28, 1913, as follows: International Research Council, \$129; International Astronomical Union, \$772; International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry, \$290; International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, \$1,338; International Union of Mathematics, \$129; in all, \$2,658, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order in order to ask a question. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether we have any treaty provision calling for the expenditure of these items?

Mr. ROGERS. There is no treaty. This is subject to a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that there is no law authorizing it.

The CHAIRMAN. To the paragraph?

Mr. BLANTON. To the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEGATION BUILDING AND GROUNDS AT SAN SALVADOR.

For filling and grading the grounds of the American legation building in the city of San Salvador, the construction on said grounds of driveways, sidewalks, tile court at back of building, fence, drains, water tank, and for such other minor improvements as may be found necessary, \$11,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONGWORTH: Page 21, after line 7, insert: "For the acquisition of land and buildings in Paris, France, to be used as the American embassy, under the provisions of the act of February 17, 1911, \$150,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is new legislation, unauthorized by law, on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I maintain that there is law which authorizes this appropriation—the law referred to in the amendment just offered, the act of February 17, 1911. That act provides—and I will read it, because it is very short:

That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized to acquire in foreign countries such sites and buildings as may be appropriated for by Congress for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States, and to alter, repair, and furnish the said buildings; suitable buildings for this purpose to be either purchased or erected, as to the Secretary of State may seem best, and all buildings so acquired for the Diplomatic Service shall be used both as the residences of diplomatic officials and for the offices of the diplomatic establishment.

The Chair will observe that so far there is absolutely no limitation as to the power of Congress to appropriate for these purposes, to wit, the acquisition of sites and buildings in foreign countries to be used for legation or embassy purposes.

There are two provisos following. The first is—

Provided, however, That not more than the sum of \$500,000 shall be expended in any fiscal year under the authorization herein made.

That limits the power of Congress to appropriate in any one year more than \$500,000. No one claims that we are attempting to do that now.

The further proviso is as follows:

And provided further, That in submitting estimates of appropriation to the Secretary of the Treasury for transmission to the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State shall set forth a limit of cost for the acquisition of sites and buildings and for the construction, alteration, repair, and furnishing of buildings at each place in which the expenditure is proposed (which limit of cost shall not exceed the sum of \$150,000 at any one place) and which limit shall not thereafter be exceeded in any case, except by new and express authorization of Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I reserve the point of order. I did not hear the amendment read.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman care to have me debate the merits of it?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; the point of order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will proceed further with the discussion of the point of order, Mr. Chairman. In the first place, I want to call the attention of the Chair particularly to this point, that there is no provision of this law which requires the Secretary of State or the Secretary of the Treasury to make any estimate. The only use of the word "shall" in this proviso occurs where it is provided that in submitting estimates he shall set forth a limit of cost, but he is not required to make any estimate unless called for by Congress. Now, I am aware of the fact that this question has been ruled on twice before, once within three or four days after the passage of this act, which was known as the Lowden Act, and another time two years later. In one case a similar amendment was held out of order. In the second case it was held in order. I submit that in both cases it should have been held to be in order, regardless of whether estimates had actually been made or not.

On February 22, 1911, Mr. Flood, of Virginia, offered this amendment to the Diplomatic bill at a point similar to this:

That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to secure, by purchase or otherwise, a suitable building for an embassy building in the City of Mexico, and \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is appropriated for that purpose.

To that Mr. Stafford made the point of order that it was not authorized by existing law. During the argument the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], for whose parliamentary opinion I, of course, have the very highest admiration and respect, made this statement:

Undoubtedly hereafter the policy will be for the Secretary of State to send in his own estimates, and those estimates will be followed; but I question whether the act requires the Secretary of State to send in an estimate. The act could not require that. What we provide is that the Secretary may acquire the buildings; that the amount in any one year shall not exceed \$500,000; and then there is a provision directing the Secretary of State to put in a limit of cost when he does send in his estimates, and when that limit of cost is included in that estimate it can not be exceeded.

A little later, the gentleman from Illinois will recall, the Chairman said:

Will the gentleman from Illinois direct his attention to the Chair for a moment? Does the gentleman argue that the act which directs the Secretary to submit an estimate of cost and which limits that cost, subject to subsequent authorizations of Congress, is a barrier to an amendment on this bill?

The reason I am reading this debate to the Chair is to show the Chair if possible that in my opinion the subsequent decision of the Chair was based upon a wrong point, and upon a point conceded by the gentleman from Illinois to have no weight. In reply to the query of the Chair the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said:

I skillfully avoided the subject. I do not wish to express an opinion on the subject, and I hope the Chair will not be called upon to express an opinion on that subject.

But, unfortunately, the Chair did express an opinion on that subject, and ruled that the amendment was out of order because no estimate of cost had been submitted, which was not a matter in issue. The ruling of the Chair is very brief. I will read it:

The existing law, act of February 17, 1911, provides that the Secretary of State shall submit estimates of appropriations to the Secretary of the Treasury for transmission to the House of Representatives—

That is just precisely what it does not do—

and it establishes a limit of cost for these buildings contemplated by the act and provides a method of establishing that limit. In the light of existing law fixing a limitation of cost, and the method of procedure by the Secretary of State, the amendment presented by the gentleman from Virginia is clearly not in order. It is new legislation, and therefore unauthorized by existing law. The Chair sustains the point of order.

In other words, the Chair sustained the point of order on precisely the ground which the gentleman from Illinois suggested ought not to be considered. Of course, at that time it was impossible that an estimate could have been made.

Two years later four or five amendments were offered—one to provide an embassy at Tokyo, another at Mexico City, and a few others. These amendments were held in order at that time, because the matter of whether the Secretary of State was compelled to send an estimate of cost was not the question. There it was admitted an estimate of cost had been sent in, and the point of order was overruled.

I submit that the decision which I have first referred to, which happened to be made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Moore, was incorrect, because he misapprehended the wording of the law. As I say, the law had been passed only a few days before. It was called to his attention suddenly, and the ground of his decision was that the existing act of February, 1911, provides that the Secretary of State shall submit estimates of appropriations.

Now, I want to call the attention of the Chair particularly to the fact that it does no such thing. It simply provides that when the Secretary of State submits estimates of appropriation to the Secretary of the Treasury for transmission to the House of Representatives he shall set forth a limit of cost.

But that does not prevent Congress from making such appropriation within the limits of either the \$500,000 in any one year or \$150,000 in any one project when the estimate has not been sent in. The Chairman of the committee in deciding that misplaced the word "shall." He assumed that the Secretary of State was compelled to send in his estimate before the Congress could make an appropriation, whereas it is evident that there is no such provision. In this case, so far as I am aware, no exact estimate of the cost or acquisition of the land or building has been made, although the last three ambassadors have sent strong recommendations to that effect. I do not know, and the chairman of the committee advises me that he is not aware, that the Secretary of State has officially transmitted those estimates here; that he is not required to do so under the law.

The reason I offer the amendment is that it will be effective in providing an embassy in Paris within the limit of cost under the Lowden bill of \$150,000. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars in our money to-day is \$450,000 in France, and the United States Government will make a profit of 66½ per cent on this transaction. I submit that it is in order under the statute under the so-called Lowden Act, and the decision of the Chair in interpreting that act in the first instance was incorrect.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio understand that the limit of the total expenditure in any one year is \$500,000?

Mr. LONGWORTH. In any one year, but I do not think that limits the power of Congress to appropriate; it only limits the expenditure to \$500,000 in any one year.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be heard?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think not; I drew the language in that law.

The CHAIRMAN. In passing on the point of order, perhaps the Chair should be somewhat specific because the proposition is important, and there is some conflict in the decisions that have been made with regard to it. The contention of the gentleman from Ohio in regard to the interpretation of the statute, it seems to the Chair, is well founded. This first provision of the act is absolutely without limitation. It states:

That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized to acquire in foreign countries such sites and buildings as may be appropriated for by Congress for the use of the Diplomatic and Consular establishments of the United States, and to alter, repair, and furnish the said buildings; suitable buildings for this purpose to be either purchased or erected, as to the Secretary of State may seem best, and all buildings so acquired for the Diplomatic Service shall be used both as the residences of diplomatic officials and for the offices of the diplomatic establishment.

That is the positive, affirmative, and material part of the statute. Now, unless that is limited in some way or other by the provisos that have been added, certainly there is ample authority for the committee considering the amendment.

The first proviso is:

Provided, however, That not more than the sum of \$500,000 shall be expended in any fiscal year under the authorization herein made.

That limitation, it would seem, as a matter of fact has not been exceeded, and there are, so far as has been called to the attention of the Chair, no other authorization for expenditures where the total would exceed the limit of \$500,000.

Now we come to the next proviso, which is the difficult proposition involved in this case:

Provided further, That in submitting estimates of appropriation to the Secretary of the Treasury for transmission to the House of Representatives the Secretary of State shall set forth a limit of cost for the acquisition of sites and buildings and for the construction, alteration, repair, and furnishing of buildings at each place in which the expenditure is proposed (which limit of cost shall not exceed the sum of \$150,000 at any one place), and which limit shall not thereafter be exceeded in any case, except by new and express authorization of Congress.

Unless this proviso makes it obligatory before Congress can make the appropriation that the Secretary of State shall submit to the Secretary of the Treasury an estimate, then the limitation does not apply in this case. The language used, as the committee will notice, is "that in submitting estimates of appropriation." That is, if estimates are made, they must be made in the manner prescribed.

Of course, the usual method in which these matters are called to the attention of the committee having the matter in

charge for consideration is upon estimates furnished by the department. The provision in this act is, in effect, that if an estimate is made by the Secretary of State and transmitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, it shall be done in the manner prescribed. But there is no requirement that such estimate must be made. It is admitted in argument that no such estimate was submitted, and the question is as to whether it could be inferred that such an estimate would be required. The Chair would not be justified in any such inference; and as the language does not specifically state that it is a prerequisite, and does not specifically state that the appropriation must not be made until such estimate has been made, the Chair thinks it is perfectly within the right of the committee to consider the amendment, and the point of order is overruled.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I suppose the Chair is not called upon probably to decide, and as far as I could understand he did not decide, that the limit of cost fixed in the proviso where an estimate is made may be exceeded where no estimate is made.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the Chair does not decide that point at all.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know how the Chair will decide it when that question comes up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Chair does not think that that is directly involved.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; I think not, myself.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS offers the following amendment to the amendment: At the end of the amendment add the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized, in his discretion, and in so far as to him seems practicable and advisable, to conclude negotiations with the Government of France, with a view, in lieu of the amount herein appropriated, to the crediting upon the obligations or debts of such Government then held by or owing to the United States, a part or all of the purchase price thereof."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I just want only to say a word, and I shall be very brief, indeed, because this is a matter that has been repeatedly called to the attention of the House. There never was a time, in my opinion, when there was so great need for having good men in our Diplomatic Service. It has been a most unfortunate fact in this country that our choice of men to hold high diplomatic positions has been confined to men of great wealth. The salary that we provide, of \$17,500 a year, is absolutely inadequate for a man properly to represent this country in any great city of Europe or of the Orient. Of course, we have been fortunate at times in finding men otherwise qualified who were fortunate enough to have a large pocketbook; but it has always seemed to me a blot upon the real democratic theory of our Government that we should find ourselves compelled to appoint to some of the highest and most important offices men of a particular class, a class occupied only by men of great wealth. There never was a time hitherto when we so much needed first-class men to represent this country abroad as now. It is rather the exception to the rule that the first-class American citizen is a man of great personal fortune. The sort of diplomacy represented by gilt tinsel and ceremony and all that sort of thing is a thing of the past. The diplomacy of the next two years is going to be attended to by hard-headed, practical men, and upon the choice of the men whom we send abroad in the next few years may lie the future of this country in great part. It is utterly impossible under our present system, which provides no residences for our representatives abroad, for anyone but a very rich man to accept these positions.

This amendment is offered at a peculiarly opportune time, it seems to me, from the standpoint of economy. The present rates of exchange in foreign countries are variable, and in many countries their money, as compared to ours, has gone almost to the vanishing point. In the case even of France an American dollar which used to buy 5 francs can now buy more than 16 francs. In other words, an American dollar to-day is three times as valuable as it used to be.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. The gentleman says that the American dollar will now buy 16 francs. What will those 16 francs buy in Paris?

Mr. LONGWORTH. They will buy of some things as many as they used to buy, and of other things they do not, but 150,000 American gold dollars will buy \$450,000 worth of land

and buildings in Paris to-day. We will be making a profit of over 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent on the transaction.

Mr. DUNBAR. Does the gentleman mean to say that a building which before the war would have sold for \$450,000 in American money can now be gotten for \$150,000 of American money?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do.

Mr. DUNBAR. Has the inflation of the currency in France not caused an inflation in the price of commodities?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I say in some things, yes; in other things, no. To-day the cost of living in France for the average family has not increased since the war, according to the best information.

Mr. DUNBAR. Does the gentleman know it to be a fact, then, that property in France has depreciated two-thirds of its former value?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not say that property has; I say that the purchasing power abroad of the franc has.

Mr. DUNBAR. The purchasing power of the franc has decreased and the property decreased or increased?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The purchasing power of the franc at home has not decreased in so far as very many articles are concerned, and as I understand it it has not decreased so far as the purchasing power of land is concerned.

Mr. DUNBAR. Is it not generally understood that with the inflation of the currency there is always an inflation in prices?

I can understand no reason why Paris should be any exception to the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Two minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will.

Mr. LAYTON. I agree with the gentleman's remarks very much, but does the gentleman think it would be a good thing at this time to go into all the capitals in the world and—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Eventually, yes; but I would not say go to all the capitals of the world just now, but the fact is we need a first-class man for the American ambassador to France. Our choice is limited under existing conditions to rich men. I call that undemocratic. I call it a blot on the laws of this country.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like—

Mr. BLANTON. Just a short question. Does the gentleman think it is any more important to buy this residence there than to buy a house in Washington for our Department of Justice?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do, because we can always get good men to fill the office of the Attorney General and others at our present salaries who are not rich men—

Mr. BLANTON. But we are renting a building now.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But we can not do so in the case of our representatives abroad, gentlemen. Now, there is one particularly good feature of this Lowden bill, to which I want to call the attention of the committee. It provides that the embassy must be used both as a residence for the ambassador himself and the chancellery, which is the place where all the affairs of the embassy are conducted and where the secretaries and the clerks work. One of the great troubles to-day is that in Paris, for instance, the American Embassy, as such, is a small house on a side street. The embassy, meaning the residence of the ambassador, depends on how rich that man is, and either is a big house in the most fashionable part of all Paris or a small house in a less fashionable part, depending solely on the pocketbook. I do not think that the pocketbook of the American ambassador should be reflected in the size of his house. I think we ought to have a uniform embassy where all men, rich or poor, can live and represent this country as it ought to be represented. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALSH offers an amendment, to follow the Longworth amendment, as follows:

"The Secretary of State is hereby authorized to accept the gift of the residence of J. P. Morgan in London, England, which has been offered to the Government of the United States as a residence for the American ambassador."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES OF THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

For salaries of consuls general, consuls, and vice consuls, as provided in the act approved February 5, 1915, entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," \$1,774,500. Every consul general, consul, vice consul, and, wherever practicable, every consular agent shall be an American citizen.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to ask a question. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill how much this \$1,774,500 for consular salaries is in excess of the amount we paid for salaries for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1917?

Mr. ROGERS. The amount that year was \$1,164,000. Now, in explanation of the increase perhaps the gentleman will permit me to suggest—

Mr. BLANTON. I understand then you are increasing this \$610,500?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes; for two reasons. Because we have completely Americanized the Consular Service in the last five years. We have weeded out the consular officers, among whom in the past there have been many foreigners. I believe the gentleman will agree with the wisdom of that policy?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. ROGERS. And in the second place, the number of consuls has very much increased in five years. And in the third place, there has been a slight salary readjustment made by Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the chairman's subcommittee of five carefully go over this item of \$610,500 increase before they put it in the bill at the request of the State Department?

Mr. ROGERS. They asked for \$1,974,500 and, as we thought, produced pretty good evidence that that sum was desirable with world conditions as they are. Nevertheless, we felt that it could be reduced by \$200,000 without impairing the service. And in the hearings the gentleman will find an explanation of where every dollar of this fund goes.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES OF CONSULAR INSPECTORS.

For the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of consular inspectors while traveling and inspecting under instructions from the Secretary of State, \$25,000: *Provided*, That inspectors shall be allowed actual and necessary expenses for subsistence, itemized, not exceeding an average of \$8 per day.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in order to be consistent, I make the point of order against the proviso providing for \$8 subsistence in the face of the law limiting it to \$5.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is not sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

POST ALLOWANCES TO DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS.

To enable the President, in his discretion, and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to diplomatic and consular officers and consular assistants and officers of the United States Court for China in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living at the posts to which they may be assigned, \$250,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not know that I care to debate the matter when the point of order is reserved.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then I will make the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. What is the point of order?

Mr. CONNALLY. That there is no authorization of law for this appropriation. I will state to the Chair that this is an item that has been appropriated heretofore for the purpose of supplementing the salaries of consuls and diplomatic officers in foreign countries because of the increased cost of living brought about by war conditions. The testimony before the committee is that now American money in every country in the world, with the possible exception of China and Mexico, is worth more than it has been for a long number of years, and so the consuls' and diplomats' salaries, as was very well explained by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Longworth] a moment ago in arguing on the purchase of the site in Paris, are worth much more or have a greater purchasing power than they did before the war. And while this item was perhaps justified during the time the war was continuing, it is not justified now, because we ought to get back to normal conditions.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. CONNALLY. I reserve it.

Mr. ROGERS. The justification for the item at this time, as it appeared to the committee, is this: First, in the Orient, as the gentleman well knows, the rate of exchange is as adverse to the United States as it is favorable in parts of Europe, and one-half of this sum is recommended in order to prevent

our officers in the Orient from finding the size of their dollar, and their consequent purchasing power, cut in two. On the Continent of Europe, I agree with the gentleman, that on the whole the cost of living has not kept up with the rise in exchange; so that in Poland, for example, or in Italy, I believe our consular officers to-day are better off with the same salary in United States dollars than they were in 1914. In the British Isles the condition is intermediate. In the British Isles the cost of living has increased threefold, according to the evidence before the committee. The rise in exchange has been about 35 per cent on the average. In other words, it costs the American consular officer in Great Britain from two to three times as much to live as it did in 1914.

So the committee, instead of giving \$600,000 or \$700,000, as has been given in the past three or four years, concluded that our officers in the Orient ought to have \$125,000 to equalize the adverse exchange. This seems a matter of fair play so far as the Orient is concerned. Then we added another \$125,000 to care for the condition in the British Isles.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if it is not a fact, with respect to the Orient, that the same conditions that exist now existed long before the war, and if there is any trouble at all it is the fact that the salaries have not been properly fixed by statute, and does not arise as a war condition? This item has been carried because it was a war item. Now, the war has ceased, and if there is any inequity in the salaries of officers in China, it is a permanent condition that has been in effect for a number of years.

Mr. ROGERS. I think the gentleman will agree that the situation in China did not begin to get troublesome until 1914, and was a reflex of the European war.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would perhaps have no objection if the gentleman would limit the appropriation to China. I object to the State Department having \$250,000 to parcel around over various parts of the world wherever it sees fit to distribute it.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman think that it is fair that a consul in Birmingham, England, for example, or in Liverpool, or in Dublin, or in Glasgow should in practice find his salary cut in two, so far as its purchasing power goes?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think that that is the true condition.

Mr. ROGERS. We have an abundance of evidence before the committee based on Federal Reserve Board statistics and on Department of Labor statistics that that fact is true. I will tell the gentleman frankly that he will be bringing about a very considerable and, it seems to me, an unwarranted hardship if he does insist on the point of order. We have tried to keep this amount down to a moderate sum. I think it ought to be larger rather than smaller.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS: Page 22, after line 9, insert "to enable the President, in his discretion and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances, during pendency of existing war and for six months after its termination, by way of additional compensation to consular and diplomatic officers in belligerent countries and countries contiguous thereto, including China and the officers at Hongkong, Saigon, Tsingtau, Darien, and Vladivostok in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living at the posts to which they may be assigned, \$250,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I wanted to ask the chairman if he does not think that the \$610,500 in excess which we have provided for in the paragraph at the bottom of page 21 is sufficient increase for these officers to make unnecessary this additional \$250,000 increase?

Mr. ROGERS. Consuls general and consuls have not had their salaries increased. The increase in the other item was mainly in connection with the creation of a group of men called vice consuls.

Mr. BLANTON. This \$610,500 is an increase in addition to the increase contained in the \$1,200,000 item?

Mr. ROGERS. That represents, as I explained a few moments ago, an increase in personnel, and also the added expense we are put to by Americanizing the service in the lower grades.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. It is unauthorized and it is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ROGERS. That item in the form it is presented was carried in the Diplomatic and Consular act of 1919, and the fact that it is available until a date six months after the termination of the existing war shows that it was not merely legislation for the fiscal year. I therefore contend that the amendment is in order.

Mr. BLANTON. That was merely on an appropriation bill, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman knows it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES, PASSPORT CONTROL ACT.

For expenses of regulating entry into the United States, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1918, and public act No. 79 of the Sixty-sixth Congress, when the latter act shall have become effective, \$600,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. BLANTON. I will reserve it. In reserving this point of order I want to ask the chairman how much of this \$600,000 is for regulating entry into the United States under this law mentioned herein, which has not yet become a law; in other words, this public act 79.

Mr. ROGERS. Public act 79 never has become a law, and presumably never will become a law, as it goes out of existence on March 4; but in view of the fact that legislatively it may come into existence before March 4, it would seem that the appropriation should be made in this language.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS: Page 25, after line 13, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For such expenses not otherwise provided for herein as may be necessary to enable the President to conduct and maintain any embassy, legation, or consular offices authorized by law, \$41,300."

Mr. BLANTON. I make a point of order that this amendment is unauthorized in the terms in which it is drawn; that it is not authorized to be put on an appropriation bill by the Appropriations Committee. It is a blanket provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is not sustained. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, which the Clerk will again report.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report again the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was again read.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota offers the following amendment to the amendment: At the end of the paragraph insert the following proviso:

"Provided, That the amounts to be expended from this appropriation for the objects hereinafter set forth shall not exceed the following respective sums: Interpreter to legation and consulate general to Persia, \$2,000; interpreter to legation and consulate general to Bangkok, \$2,000; for 10 student interpreters at the legation to China, at \$1,500 each, \$15,000; for the payment of the cost of tuition of 10 student interpreters in China, at the rate of \$350 per annum each, \$3,500; for 6 interpreters at the embassy to Japan, at \$1,500 each, \$9,000; for the payment of the cost of tuition of 6 student interpreters at the embassy to Japan, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$1,200; for 4 student interpreters at the embassy to Turkey, at \$1,500 each, \$6,000; for the payment of the cost of tuition of 4 student interpreters at the embassy to Turkey, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$800; for rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the embassy to Japan, \$1,200; for rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the embassy to Turkey, \$600."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by law, and that the Chair has already ruled on that matter.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the Chair will note that the amendment offered is in the nature of a limitation and a restriction on the Department of State in spending the money that is included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. It is therefore not in the nature of legislation but a limitation and restriction upon the appropriation that has already been offered and held in order.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to submit that this is merely a conspiracy between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON], trying to put back into the bill something out of order and something that the Chair has held out of order. It is a subterfuge on the part of two gentlemen acting conjointly. It is a frame-up, as some Member suggests. I submit that my point of order is good and that it should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was considered, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, on page 22, line 10, after the words "diplomatic and consular officers," insert "to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of April 15, 1918, for post allowances to consular and diplomatic officers, \$250,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEMPLE: Page 22, line 10, after the words "diplomatic and consular officers," insert "to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of April 15, 1918, for post allowances to consular and diplomatic officers, \$250,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is not germane to the paragraph. We have passed page 22, and it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I now offer the amendment to the page where we now are.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, after line 13, following the amendment just adopted, insert the following:

"To enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of April 15, 1918, for post allowances to consular and diplomatic officers, \$250,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by law.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is not germane to that portion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, two points of order are pending. One is that it is not germane to the paragraph. To that I wish to say that it is offered as a new paragraph, and it does not have to be germane to the paragraph that precedes it or to the paragraph that may follow it. It stands alone as a new paragraph, if it is germane to the bill, and the point has not been made that it is not. That point certainly would not lie. It is germane to the bill and will fit in in any particular place in the bill.

As to the other point of order, that it is an appropriation not provided for in law, I read from the act to which the paragraph itself specifically refers, the act of April 15, 1918. There an appropriation was made—

To enable the President, in his discretion and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances during the pendency of the war and for six months after its termination—

And so forth.

It seems to me that that is legislation which is permanent in the sense that all our war-time legislation was permanent, to last until the termination of the war and for a certain period after the war, and we made appropriation after appropriation under acts that carried exactly that provision. So, although this was carried in an appropriation bill, it is legislation and fixes a certain condition that is to be recognized as law during the pendency of the war and for six months after peace is concluded. Of course, if that is the case, like all of the other legislative bills under which appropriations were made, it is authority in law for future appropriations.

Mr. BLANTON. That was carried in an appropriation act.

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes; it was carried in an appropriation act, but that item of legislation is in it, and it is law, whether it was first adopted in an appropriation act or somewhere else.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, the act in which the language quoted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE] was carried was the Diplomatic appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919. The item is very much like the item which appeared in the committee print of this bill:

To enable the President, in his discretion and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances during the pendency of the existing war and for six months after its termination, by way of additional compensation to the consular and diplomatic officers in belligerent countries, and countries contiguous thereto, including China, officers at Hongkong—

And so on.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that it does not purport to be permanent law, but was applicable only to the appropriations carried in the act. It really partakes of the nature of a limitation, because if the war had ended prior to the end of the fiscal year of 1919, six months thereafter the

authority of the President would have come to an end; the power of the President to expend the \$700,000 automatically would have terminated, even though the appropriation year had not expired. Really, the act simply authorizes the expenditure of \$700,000 to be used by the President, when? During the year 1919, provided that during that year the state of war continued. It does not purport to be permanent law in any sense, any more than the language appearing in this committee print of the bill now before the House purports to be permanent law. It simply makes it possible for the President during the life of that appropriation bill to make these allowances, and it is clearly in the nature of a limitation on the appropriation.

On the question of germaneness, I submit that this item on its face purports to be an increase of the consular and diplomatic salaries, and if it is germane at all it must be germane to those items in the bill which provide salaries for consuls and diplomatic officers. Those items are to be found on page 21, salaries of consular service; page 22, salaries of consular assistants; and page 22, allowances for clerk hire, United States consuls. It certainly is not germane to that portion of the bill to which it is offered, the matter of regulating the entry of aliens into the United States by the passport-control act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 15872, had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE ON SUNDAY.

The SPEAKER. To-morrow the House meets for memorial exercises for the late Senator BANKHEAD and the Chair would like to designate the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BLACKMON, to preside.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment accepting the gift of the Morgan home in London.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Longworth amendment.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as a number of Members are not acquainted with what is in the bill, I ask that all amendments be read and demand a separate vote upon them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SWOPE, for five days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. MONTAGUE (on request of Mr. BLAND of Virginia), from the city, on public business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House, under its former order, adjourned to meet to-morrow, Sunday, January 30, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

377. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting report of the claim of the postmaster at Bedford, Pa., for reimbursement for funds lost through burglary; to the Committee on Claims.

378. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriation for contingent ex-

penses of the War Department during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

379. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Air Service covering publications issued by the Air Service of the Army during the fiscal year 1920; to the Committee on Printing.

380. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting list of useless executive papers in that department and requesting their disposition; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

381. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting report in connection with useless executive papers in that department and requesting their disposition; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1264), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4825) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between the States of Oregon and Washington, at or within 2 miles westerly from Cascade Locks, in the State of Oregon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1265), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SINNOTT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15880) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1266), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 146) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Senate certain detailed information secured from income and profits tax returns of taxable year 1918, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1267), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SELLS, from the Committee on Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15873) to authorize the appropriation of additional sums for Federal aid in the construction of post roads, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1268), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHINDBLOM, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 461) to amend section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the operation of Government-owned radio stations for the use of the general public, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1920, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1269), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITE of Maine, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15695) to amend section 6 of the act of Congress entitled "An act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska," approved June 26, 1906, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1270), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15525) to provide for the establishment of a Mississippi River, in the State of Wisconsin, of a fish-rescue station, to be under the direction of the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1271), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 15944) to authorize reduced rates of transportation for members of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 15945) authorizing an appropriation for the World's Poultry Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 462) authorizing the installation of water meters in buildings occupied by the executive and municipal departments and governmental institutions in the District of Columbia, and for the establishment of rates for water used therein; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARSS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting that Federal authorities discontinue operations of barges, boats, and other transportation facilities, operating on the canals in New York State, at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 15946) granting a pension to Elisha R. Kenyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 15947) granting a pension to Amanda Riley, formerly Amanda Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Resolution (H. Res. 656) authorizing the payment of \$800 to H. M. Vandervort for extra and expert services to the Committee on Invalid Pensions during the third session of the Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SELLS: Resolution (H. Res. 657) authorizing the payment of \$1,200 to Wayne W. Cordell for extra and expert services rendered to the Committee on Pensions during the second and third sessions of the Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5348. By Mr. CANNON: Petition of sundry citizens of Kankakee, Ill., requesting the recognition by our Government of the existing republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5349. By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: Petition of Samuel Bowser and 24 others, urging favorable consideration of the Fess-Capper bill; to the Committee on Education.

5350. Also, petition of Harvey Stauffer and 14 others, urging favorable consideration of the Fess-Capper bill; to the Committee on Education.

5351. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Progressive Lodge, No. 440, International Association of Machinists, of Rockford, Ill., favoring resumption of trade with soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5352. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Chinese Society of America, urging adequate appropriation for the work of the Department of Commerce in extending trade with China; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5353. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Albert W. Adt, Harry H. Wilson, William B. Wood, G. W. Houck, William B. McCaddin, Garner W. Denmead, and Louis H. Palmer, all of Baltimore, advocating modification of present tax system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5354. Also, petition of Elias Petts, LeRoy T. Feiser, Hadassah Chapter, George W. Ebaugh, and Alumnae Association, Eastern High School, all of Baltimore, indorsing Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5355. Also, petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, Baltimore, protesting against S. 4542; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5356. Also, petition of Armstrong, Cator & Co., Baltimore, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to make partial payments to railroads of sums certified by the Interstate Commerce

Commission as due them from the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5357. Also, petition of Joseph Marsbeck, jr., Baltimore, indorsing S. 4606; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5358. Also, petition of the State roads commission, Baltimore, approving the Sells bill, H. R. 15873; to the Committee on Roads.

5359. Also, petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, Baltimore, protesting against the Calder bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5360. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of employees of the Steamboat-Inspection Service, favoring the passage of House bill 15746 and Senate bill 4839; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

5361. By Mr. PETERS: Petition of W. L. Welsh and 410 others, of Belfast, Me., favoring the emergency tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5362. Also, petition of W. M. Kelsey and 89 others, of Brooks, Me., protesting against the importation of potatoes into the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5363. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of the Outlook Club, of Beaver Falls, Pa., in support of the Sheppard-Towner bills (S. 3259, H. R. 10925); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5364. Also, petition of the Outlook Club, of Beaver Falls, Pa., protesting against the Yellowstone Park encroachment bill (H. R. 12466); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

5365. Also, petition of the Outlook Club, of Beaver Falls, Pa., supporting the Smith-Towner bills (S. 1017, H. R. 7); to the Committee on Education.

5366. Also, petition of Ralf Gaston, route No. 7, New Castle, Pa., and others, protesting against a daylight saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5367. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of Principals' Association, of Baltimore city, indorsing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, *January 30, 1921.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Mr. BLACKMON as Speaker pro tempore.

Rev. William Couden, of Concord, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the revelation through Christ's gospel that enables our souls when prostrate to look up into Thy face beyond all shadows and to call Thee "Our Father." This morning we assemble out of reverence for a good man who has passed from us to return no more. We are glad to remember his personal charm and integrity, his rich mentality, and his public loyalty in the service of his town, his county, his State, and his Nation, both as Representative and Senator. Though he will be missed here, we feel that to him can be applied the words that were spoken of ex-President Benjamin Harrison:

Great lives do not go out; they go on.

Bless, we pray Thee, the great and holy matters in which this man was interested; the welfare of our country, the spread of justice, and the establishment of truth and love. Encourage those who were his colleagues in promoting every good cause.

Especially, we beseech Thee, to pour out Thy merciful and gracious healing upon the group of his near friends and kinsfolk. Breathe Thy spirit of comfort upon his very dearest, the members of his family whose hearts are burdened with the heavy load of missing daily his intimate presence. May they find to hand all those Christian powers that enable Thy children to sorrow not as those who are without hope in Jesus. And, finally, through the Redeemer's triumph, bring us all with sins forgiven and in perfect peace to our heavenly home. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be deferred until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be deferred until to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE SENATOR BANKHEAD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the special order.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. DENT, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That Sunday, January 30, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, late a Senator from the State of Alabama.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 658.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD, late a Senator from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the late Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD of Alabama was for 20 years a member of this body before going to the Senate 13 years ago. His long, conspicuous, and honorable service here makes it indeed appropriate that this time should be set apart to pay tribute to his memory. The Senate, of which body he was a member at the time of his death, has already memorialized his life and character. His former colleagues there, particularly the senior Senator from his own State, have given in detail the long public service which he rendered to his native State. It would be useless for me to now repeat the details. Suffice it to say that his record as a Confederate soldier, his service in both branches of the Alabama legislature, and his career as a Representative from that State in both Houses of Congress speak for themselves.

It is seldom given to any man to have such a long, useful, and almost unbroken career in public life, and I am sure no man filled the trusts committed to him with greater faithfulness or more signal ability.

Senator BANKHEAD was indeed a remarkable man. In every undertaking he was accurate, painstaking, and thorough. Though not a lawyer by profession, I heard him make a most splendid legal argument in the Senate relative to the amendment providing for the direct election of Senators when the governor of Alabama made an appointment to fill a vacancy in the Senate from that State.

He had a clear and a broad vision, observing the possibilities for the development of his State and the country at large as few men have been given the faculty to foresee.

Unquestionably he was one of the wisest counselors it has been my privilege to know. When I came to Congress about 12 years ago I acquired his friendship and often sought his advice. I do not recall that in a single instance his judgment was in error. I speak from the heart when I say in his death I lost a real friend.

He was a practical statesman. He did much for Alabama, as much, I may say, without making objectionable comparisons, as any man who ever represented her in the halls of Congress, and his memory will be forever enshrined in the hearts of a grateful people whom he served so faithfully and so well.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, we do not come here to-day to mourn the death of Senator BANKHEAD, for it is just as natural to die as it is to live. We come to pay tribute to his memory, and to his work and his life.

I had the privilege of serving in this House with Senator BANKHEAD before he went to the Senate. I served with him on the Rivers and Harbors Committee and in other activities. After he left the House it was my privilege to serve with him on conferences between the House and the Senate. It was also my privilege to serve with him as a member of the joint commission on postal salaries.

In my judgment Senator BANKHEAD was one of the plainest of the good, common, everyday citizens of this Nation. He never assumed that public place gave him superior rights. He realized that he was one of the people, and he never lost sight of the fact that the people of the Nation are the rulers of the Nation. He lived a life of patriotism. His patriotism was intense, as tender as the affection of son for mother, as strong